

SOCIAL PROBLEMS

VOLUME 2

APRIL, 1955

NUMBER 4

DESEGREGATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Consulting Editor for the Symposium

KENNETH B. CLARK

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

JAN 31 1956

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

Introduction	KENNETH B. CLARK	197
Desegregation and Social Change	IRA DE A. REID	198
The Role of the NAACP	BOY WILKINS	201
The Challenge to Southern Social Scientists and Educators	HERMAN H. LONG	204
Scholastic Achievement of Negro Children in Desegregated Schools	RICHARD L. PLAUT	205
Protestant Churches and Public School Desegregation	OSCAR J. LEE	212
Legal Background of the May 17th Decision	ROBERT L. CARTER	215
Conclusions	KENNETH B. CLARK	218
Text of the Supreme Court Opinions		221
Appendix to Appellants' Briefs: Statement by Social Scientists		227

BOOK REVIEWS

H. T. Christensen J. A. Clausen S. E. Weinberg N. L. Whetten

OFFICIAL REPORTS

NEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

INDEX

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY FOR
THE STUDY OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS

SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Official Journal of the Society for the Study of Social Problems

EDITOR

JEROME HIRSHLEICH, *Brandeis University*

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

SIDNEY H. ARONSON, *Brooklyn College*

SYLVIA FLEIS PAVA, *Brooklyn College*

ALFRED P. PARSELL, *City College of New York*

ROBERT MANNERS, *Brandeis University*

BOOK REVIEW EDITOR

SAMUEL KOENIG, *Brooklyn College*

ADVISORY EDITORS

HOWARD BECKER, *University of Wisconsin*

E. FRANKLIN FRAZIER, *Howard University*

JOHN P. GILLIN, *University of North Carolina*

A. LIVING HALLOWELL, *University of Pennsylvania*

OTTO KLINGBERG, *Columbia University*

CLYDE KLUCKHOHN, *Harvard University*

MAX LERNER, *Brandeis University*

ABRAHAM H. MASLOW, *Brandeis University*

FRANCIS E. MERRILL, *Dartmouth College*

ROBERT K. MERTON, *Columbia University*

ROBIN M. WILLIAMS, Jr., *Cornell University*

EDITORIAL AND PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS

HORNELL HART, *Duke University*

SAMUEL KOENIG, *Brooklyn College*

ELIZABETH BRIANT LEE, *Malverne, L. I., N. Y.*, Chairman

AUSTIN L. PORTERFIELD, *Texas Christian University*

GEORGE SIMPSON, *Brooklyn College*

Social Problems is published quarterly by the Society for the Study of Social Problems. Membership dues of the Society, including subscription, are \$5.00 per year for Active and Associate members; \$6.00 for Joint members; and \$3.00 for Student members. Subscription rate for non-members, \$4.00. Single issues, \$1.00.

Manuscripts and communications for the editor should be addressed to the Editor, *SOCIAL PROBLEMS*, Brandeis University, Waltham 54, Mass. Communications regarding book reviews, advertising, or subscriptions should be addressed respectively to the Book Review Editor, the Advertising Manager, or the Business Manager, *SOCIAL PROBLEMS*, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn 14, N. Y. Authors are requested to send two double-spaced typed copies (an original and a carbon) of their manuscripts, which ordinarily should not exceed 5,000 words. References should be arranged in alphabetical order at the end of the article and should not be placed at the bottom of each page.

Authors who wish to enter the competition for the Helen DeRoy Award of \$500 should consult the announcement on the outside back cover of this issue of *SOCIAL PROBLEMS*.

(Copyright 1955 by the Society for the Study of Social Problems)

A SYMPOSIUM ON DESEGREGATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

INTRODUCTION

KENNETH B. CLARK

*City College of New York
and*

Northside Center for Child Development

As this issue of SOCIAL PROBLEMS goes to press, the United States Supreme Court is considering the arguments on the type of decree it should formulate in order to insure an effective transition from segregated to non-segregated public schools. On May 17, 1954 when the Court ruled that state laws that required or permitted racial segregation in public education were unconstitutional, it left for further arguments—completed during the week of April 11, 1955—the question of whether an implementation decree should require that the "Negro children should forthwith be admitted to schools of their choice" or whether the Court "should permit an effective gradual adjustment to be brought about from existing segregated systems to a system not based on color distinctions." The Court was concerned also with the problems involved in the specific issues of an implementation decree and whether it, a special master, or the Federal District Court should be charged with the responsibility of formulating detailed decrees.

Social scientists who had been working with the Legal Staff of the NAACP were asked to collect and analyze the best available social science evidence which could be incorporated into the legal briefs and oral arguments in answering these questions.

The specific form of the Supreme Court's decree will determine the legal basis for the transition from segregated to non-segregated schools. The actual process and rate of social change precipitated by the May 17, 1954 decision and the forthcoming implementation decree or decrees will be determined by many complex and interrelated social and community factors.

If the transition from a segregated to a non-segregated society is to be effective, there must be intelligent understanding and appraisal of these factors by those in positions of political, educational, economic and religious power. Furthermore, whatever might have been the contributions of social scientists to the success of these cases to date, it is even more imperative that social science knowledge, techniques and research be placed at the disposal of those individuals in our society who must resolve these problems with a minimum of trial and error, preconceptions, subjectivism and rigidities based upon past biases.

Specifically, it is the responsibility of the social scientists to study and analyze the problems of these vast present and future structural changes which racial desegregation imposes on our society. Significant changes in any aspect of a complex social structure, necessarily involve changes in the total pattern. Social scientists are now provided with a natural social laboratory in which to observe the many components of social change; sharpen and test hypotheses; test the accuracy of predictions; and derive systematic knowledge which will have practical and theoretical value.

Already, a regional pattern in initial reactions to the demand for desegregation appears to be emerging. Some communities in the Border states of Kansas, Missouri, Maryland, West Virginia, Delaware and the District of Columbia have taken steps to desegregate their schools before being required to do so by the specific decree of the Supreme Court. On the other hand, a hard core of resistance to public school desegregation is being stimulat-

ed or reinforced by political figures in such states as Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina and to some extent also in Virginia, Florida, Alabama and Louisiana. It is difficult at present to determine the decree of resistance to or acceptance of desegregation in Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Tennessee, Kentucky and North Carolina. The political leaders in these states have not assumed a defiant attitude toward public school desegregation.

Political officials in the more intransigent states have advocated various devices for evading the Supreme Court's ruling. Their lawyers have argued before the Supreme Court that their people cannot be "forced" to desegregate their schools. They insist that the Court must grant an "indefinite" amount of time so that the people can be "prepared" to accept non-segregated schools.

At the time of this writing, it is not known to what extent the Supreme Court will be influenced by these arguments. It is clear, however, that these arguments are based upon a lack of clarity in distinguishing between racial "desegregation" and racial "integration." Desegregation is a social process which involves the removal of racial barriers and restrictions in the enjoyment of any public or private ac-

commodation or service. The barriers may be removed by laws, judicial decisions or other forms of political, economic or moral authority. Integration on the other hand is for the most part an individual process. It is subjective in that it involves changes in attitudes and feelings and the removal of fears, hatreds, and suspicions.

Experience has demonstrated that schools can be desegregated within the time required for the necessary administrative changes, i. e., "forthwith."

It is the integration which cannot be accomplished immediately or "overnight." Integration it appears, takes time — must be gradual. Desegregation, however, is a necessary antecedent to integration and can be and probably must be brought about in a relatively short period of time.

It is hoped that the articles in this issue of **SOCIAL PROBLEMS** will provide a basis for more systematic thinking, research and action on problems of racial desegregation and integration. To the extent that social scientists continue to contribute to an effective, just and democratic solution of these problems they will also contribute to the improvement in the standards of education for all American children and will contribute thereby to the stability of our society.

DESEGREGATION AND SOCIAL CHANGE AT THE COMMUNITY LEVEL

IRA DE A. REID

Haverford College

Before attempting specific answers to these questions it is necessary to clear away the mist of two misconceptions which I think obfuscate our considerations of desegregation. Some time ago I read the translation of a Japanese *tanka*, the idea of which was that the lover perished because he persisted in interpreting love in terms of "two" rather than "one." Increasingly, it seems, our operational interpretation of desegregation is in terms of two races rather than one community.

This is the first misconception.

The second misconception might be called one of semantics. We seem prone to think of desegregation as a sort of denuding or unfrocking process as a result of which the segregated public school system, like the fictional emperor, is stripped of its old clothes and wears only a new and invisible cloak of illegality. But segregation is more than an unfrocking. It is also an outfitting of the public school system in a cloak of integra-

tion, legal and moral. This two-way interpretation of desegregation permits us to regard the process as a constructive and dynamic one designed to fit the school system in proper attire for democratic appearance and service.

I do not know that I can give specific prescriptions for conducting an effective desegregation program in a given community. Desegregation is a revolutionary procedure, involving sharp and sweeping changes in the thoughts and behavior of the persons, groups, interests, and communities facing it. This fact of radical change need not be viewed with alarm, however, for the process has been going on in our communities in one way or another throughout this century. Because of this body of experience the sociologist can submit the following observations about the factors that are to be considered in making effective the desegregation process. Underlying these observations is the assumption that effective desegregation is attainable only when undertaken with a full knowledge and use of the facts of community, and with a willingness to accept change as a normal phase of community development.

FACTORS LIKELY TO CONTRIBUTE TO EFFECTIVE DESEGREGATION

1. *Recognition of desegregation as a four-fold process involving persons, groups, interests, and institutions in an interrelationship.* Too frequently it is assumed that desegregation involves only problems classed as "racial" and "educational" ones. This awareness would lead the community to realize that though persons may be labelled white or colored they do not always act within that framework; that the groups to which persons belong may have viewpoints about desegregation that are not consistent with the individual opinions; that the interests of these persons and groups may be at variance with the principle of desegregation — as individuals they may favor the step, but their economic interests or their political interest may be adversely affected by its implemen-

tation; that one of the easiest aspects of community life to be changed is that of its institutional structures: structures themselves offer no resistance to the proposed changes, the resistances come from persons and groups acting in terms of such interests as seem important to them individually and collectively.

2. *Desegregation is most effective when the program undertaken by the public schools has the open approval and support of all arms of the government of which it is a part.* No institution is an island unto itself. No evidence seems to support a principle that the public school can initiate and prosecute effective changes without the full support of the government which maintains it.

3. *The introduction of a desegregation program should be preceded by a clear and forthright statement of the policy to be pursued and of the ways in which that policy is to be implemented.* The policy statement should be a decision of the policy-making body and not an apology for supporting a court decision.

4. *The policy statement should be reinforced with sanctions that will be applied where and when the policy implementation is violated.* These sanctions will be interpreted to the community as devices for upholding and protecting the institutions of democratic government.

5. *In effecting a program of desegregation the community will not ally the new program with any existing forms of racial discrimination, nor will it base it upon any existing discriminatory or segregative practices.* This means, for most communities, that programs of desegregation will not be based upon existing patterns of segregated residential occupancy areas. Desegregation is a total process involving the establishment of a new way of life for the community. Any encumbrance that is attached to the process will minimize its effectiveness.

6. *The community that locates, identifies, and discourages patterned*

evasions of the desegregation program will find it easier to effect community acceptance of the change than will the community that seeks to ignore or that refuses to expose these practices. The practices of establishing quotas of integration or of maintaining token efforts at desegregation may be classed as patterned evasions in the desegregation process.

7. Effective desegregation is achieved to the degree that a community is able to move beyond the level of association to that of allegiance. The mere assignment of students and teachers to new schools where they associate with white and nonwhite pupils and teachers is not to be regarded as effective desegregation. The process of desegregation has come full circle when that association becomes the basis for cooperation and loyalty to the new relationship, regarding that relationship as the germ of the new democratic community.

8. The effective desegregation program provides new surrogates, or otherwise adequate satisfactions for all groups affected by the changes. All persons, groups, interests and institutions are affected by the changes inherent in the desegregation process. It would be folly to assume that no losses in status and security are experienced in the process. No changes occur which do not disadvantage some persons and some groups. It is important that the community recognize its responsibility for providing ways and means to offset the temporary losses that are experienced during the early stages of the desegregation program. The extent to which the community becomes aware of efforts to stimulate adequate adjustments for all concerned may become the precursor of effective community acceptance.

I have endeavored to indicate above some situations favorable to effective desegregation. If I were to spell out the operating factors, the list would include these characteristics: the community that has a high level of citizenship participation, free and open channels of communication, possess-

ing a school system that has the respect of the community because of its program, its teachers, and its freedom from untoward political interference, where the social and economic inequalities of its citizens are not extreme, where people are known across the racial line for other than employer-employee or master-servant relationships, where there is a relatively high level of adult literacy, and where transportation facilities permit high mobility throughout the city . . . that community will be able to establish desegregated schools with a minimum amount of difficulty even if racial segregation is a normal part of its daily routine.

On the other hand, the community that has all of this plus a strong sense of identification with local neighborhoods may be very difficult to desegregate. (Do not confuse the neighborhood-identification with neighborhood-organization-identification, such as is found in Washington, D.C.) Likewise, a community with a relatively high incidence of young home owners having children in schools may present more difficulties than a community where young families are less stabilized economically and rent rather than own their homes. Areas where there are "open occupancy" procedures in public housing may be easier to change than those areas where racial occupancy arrangements have reenforced or reestablished residential segregation.

In principle, then, the effective desegregation of the public schools in any community will be determined in part by the ways in which the balance of persons, groups, interests, and institutions is maintained. The "good" community is one that effectively maintains and, when necessary, shifts this balance. The fulcrum is effective citizen participation, so developed that the community is geared to meet change with new social inventions, such as desegregation, and is prepared to recognize differences without using them as tools for divisiveness.

THE ROLE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE IN THE DESEGREGATION PROCESS

ROY WILKINS

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People

Because the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People played a major role in the legal action which resulted in the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, it is natural that estimates of its continuing activity would place major emphasis on law suits. This is doubly logical in view of the fact that its attorneys now are armed with an actual opinion on the unconstitutionality of racially segregated schools, rather than the mere belief in that unconstitutionality and the hope of such a pronouncement.

But, popular opinion to the contrary, the NAACP would prefer using legal action as a last resort in the many situations which will arise in hundreds of communities. The basic question has been solved: racially segregated schools are unconstitutional. The complexities ahead involve compliance. How shall the Court's opinion be implemented? The approach and program of the NAACP to implementation has already taken shape, influenced in part by the traditional policy of the Association (for first-class citizenship free of discrimination and segregation) and by events immediately before and since May 17.

1. Pending the handing down of decrees in the specific cases before the highest court, the NAACP has sought to persuade states and school districts to desegregate in compliance with the opinion.

The first step in this effort was a meeting in Atlanta, Georgia, five days after the decision, of seventeen Southern state presidents of the Association where the Atlanta Declaration was formulated. This Declaration asserted:

Having canvassed the situation in each of our states, we approach the fu-

ture with the utmost confidence . . . We stand ready to work with other law-abiding citizens who are anxious to translate this decision into a program of action to eradicate racial segregation in public education as speedily as possible.

In pursuit of our objectives, we will accelerate our community action program to win public acceptance of the Court's desegregation order from all segments of the population . . . we are confident of the support of teachers, parents, labor, church, civic, fraternal, social, business and professional organizations.

Petitions asking compliance were drawn and local NAACP branches in communities which had had compulsory school segregation presented these to local school boards. Some few boards refused to receive NAACP delegations, the majority received and put aside the petitions, and a goodly number began action at once on desegregation plans.

This NAACP action, plus other factors, including the conviction of responsible public officials that segregation should be eliminated, helped in the Missouri change-over, which must be regarded as the best state-wide compliance program so far in the nation. In the Baltimore transition the NAACP branch played an effective role in consultations with school and city officials. Much the same action was taken by the little NAACP branch in Hobbs, New Mexico.

Two of the five communities which came before the Court have abolished segregation in their schools: Washington, D.C., and Topeka, Kansas. The Delaware district involved already has mixed schools under a lower court decision and the decree can thus only prohibit the state of Delaware (the appellant) from upsetting the present system there. That leaves two school districts, one in Virginia

and one in South Carolina, to be directly affected by the decrees.

NAACP local chapters, backed by the national organization, will join other agencies and citizens in these communities in seeking compliance with the terms of the Court order. Moreover, with the Court order as a pattern, the Association will continue to work with any and all groups in affected communities to effect a transition without resort to legal action.

2. The NAACP will resist efforts in areas outside the compulsory segregation belt to institute or continue a variety of forms of segregation, using the Court opinion and decrees as added weapons.

It has been popular to charge "the South" with racial discrimination and segregation and to suppose that other areas are guiltless. While the South has been the greatest and most consistent practitioner of racial discrimination, certain Northern communities have also practised discrimination, even on the school question. Indiana, southern Illinois and southern Ohio until very recently had racially segregated schools, as did Arizona. Less than ten years ago southern New Jersey had separate schools.

Even in the face of the May 17 opinion some Northern towns are persisting in practices which, in effect, enforce segregation in public schools. Gerrymandering is a popular device and is being used (and challenged) in Englewood, New Jersey, and Hempstead, New York. The New Jersey Division Against Discrimination has acted on the complaint of Negro parents in Englewood, and the NAACP is active on the Hempstead situation. Both towns drew district lines in such a manner as to require the attendance of Negro children at an all-Negro school.

In Benton Harbor, Michigan a somewhat different device was attempted. A new school was built in an all-Negro neighborhood and the Negro children who had been attending a mixed school nearby were as-

signed to the new building. However, the Negro principal of the mixed school was retained in her post.

Settlement of the uproar over the new pattern still left an all-Negro school, but with the children divided by grade, not by race, so that the older Negro children were re-enrolled in the mixed school.

Thus school site selection and school construction programs are added to gerrymandering as devices for maintaining segregated patterns. These and other schemes, frequently camouflaged in school board resolutions whose language must be carefully analyzed, will claim the attention of NAACP units throughout the country.

3. The NAACP will seek to safeguard the moral and tenure rights of Negro teachers in the assignment of personnel in desegregated systems. To this end, a new section (headed by Dr. John W. Davis, former president of West Virginia State College) has been added to the Legal Defense arm of the Association.

It was announced that this department to protect Negro teachers and principals from racial discrimination would develop an educational program to advise the teachers of their rights and employment status, and to counsel with them during the desegregation process. This action was in line with the Atlanta Declaration which had insisted that there be "integration at all levels including the assignment of teacher personnel on a non-discriminatory basis."

Thus far, no great problems have arisen with teachers. In Phoenix, Tucson, Washington, Baltimore, St. Louis and smaller cities and towns Negro teachers have been retained in the new system, although, in a very few instances, some have lost their jobs.

The desegregation of the St. Louis high schools indicates the pattern which may be expected in centers of heavy Negro population. Here the two Negro high schools remain as they were, except that instead of

drawn
gro
they
areas
school
gro.
side th
forme
facult
the pr
teache
newly

In
will b
tions
logica
will l
sale l
itself
there
the sc
where
to be

It i
treme
ers in
numb
will l
Where
and w
qualif
such
have a

4.
allocat
federal
or sch
compl
opinio
At
of di
resolut

T
aid
eve
sho
ing
abl
wit
stit

This
repea
the an
tion a
Decla

drawing their students from the Negro population of the entire city, they now draw from the residential areas immediately surrounding the schools. These areas are solidly Negro. All Negro students living outside these areas now attend what were formerly "white" high schools. The faculties of the two schools remain for the present all-Negro, but some Negro teachers have been assigned to the newly mixed schools.

In the main, the teacher problem will be met in this manner, or variations of it, so that there is little logical prospect that Negro teachers will lose their employment in wholesale lots. The NAACP will address itself to those situations in which there is a threat of mass dismissals on the score of race, or to any situation where even a single dismissal seems to be motivated by race alone.

It is not anticipated, in view of the tremendous overall shortage of teachers in the nation, that any appreciable number of qualified Negro teachers will be dismissed from their posts. Where legitimate consolidations occur and where seniority, tenure rights, and qualifications are taken into account, such teachers as are displaced will have aid in seeking new posts.

4. The NAACP will oppose the allocation of any and all forms of federal aid to education to those states or school districts which refuse to comply with the Supreme Court opinion.

At a meeting of the national board of directors, February 14, 1955, a resolution was adopted providing:

That any new federal legislation in aid of education in the states at whatever level or of whatever character should contain corrective and safeguarding features which make such aid available only to such states as comply fully with the spirit and purpose of the Constitution.

This sentiment has been expressed repeatedly in resolutions adopted by the annual conventions of the Association and was set forth in the Atlanta Declaration as follows:

... we strongly support federal aid to assist our states in the building of new schools and the expansion of educational facilities for all our children, provided that any such legislation contains the necessary safeguards to insure the distribution of funds in accordance with the court's decision.

The NAACP position is simply that since racially segregated public school systems have been declared unconstitutional, no federal funds should be allocated to those areas which defy what is now the law of the land. This applies specifically to legislation pending in the 84th Congress to aid the states in building new schools.

5. Needless to say, if all other methods fail, the NAACP legal staff will make its services available to any Negro parents in any school district who wish to challenge in court those local school authorities who choose to ignore, evade, or openly defy the ruling of May 17.

The Association believes that the rights of the children to equal education are paramount. The nation's highest court has declared that such equal education cannot be secured in a racially segregated system. While recognizing the existence of certain administrative problems (and certain psychological ones), the NAACP believes all these can be solved in a reasonable time if they are attacked by responsible officials and bodies of citizens — if a beginning is made on a plan to comply. Failing such a beginning, the situations must ultimately be brought before the courts for examination and determination.

The NAACP believes, as was stated at Atlanta, that substantial numbers of white Southerners want to abide by the Constitution and are willing to begin, in their school districts, a program of desegregation. Many of these people have been intimidated by extremely vocal politicians and seekers or holders of public office who, in some places, have crudely cast the school question in a setting where decent people hesitate to become embroiled.

Despite this hysteria and the frantic actions by South Carolina, Georgia and Mississippi legislatures looking to the abolition of the public schools, the NAACP is confident that on a people-to-people, school-district-to-school district level, desegregation will move forward once the Supreme Court has handed down its decrees on procedure. Americans are basically law-abiding. Americans are basically fair. There is nothing fair about the Jim Crow school system. Even die-hard opponents of integration now freely admit (as they scramble for delay and any device for non-compliance) that the segregated school was *not* equal. Their unequal and unfair system has

been dragged out into the light, spread before the nation's highest court, measured against the guarantees of the United States Constitution and found wanting. At such a stage they will fume and fulminate and call upon tradition and custom; they will deliver political orations, and summon the myths that have served so well in the past. But, unless they should make the extremely unlikely choice of leaving the Federal union, in the end (and sooner than many now think) they will act as Americans have always acted when fair play is demanded. There will be a new order and they will bring it about.

THE CHALLENGE OF DESEGREGATION TO SOUTHERN SOCIAL SCIENTISTS AND EDUCATORS

HERMAN H. LONG

*Fisk University and Race Relations Department, American Missionary
Association, Congregational Christian Churches*

Toward the end of World War II, an article appeared in one of the South's best literary journals which received widespread discussion in both professional and lay circles. It was reprinted, in part or in its entirety, by several newspapers. Editorial writers seized upon it skillfully-presented arguments for special comment, recognizing in its content a respectable, intellectual counterbalance to trends and opinions which had virtually revolutionized the traditional racial system. Written under the title "Preface to Decision" by Donald Davidson, a historical and literary scholar of the South, the article observed that the sociologist had become the "chief expert consultant on the Negro problem" (2, p. 395); warned that the modern liberal, "walled up in sociological abstractions," would incur a guilt similar to that of the abolitionist in the effort to do justice (2, pp. 411-412); and urged southern leadership to maintain the traditional bi-racial system

and set "appropriate limits of the concessions the South is willing to make on the Negro problem." (2, p. 411)

This illustrates, at least from the viewpoint of those opposed to the so-called "liberal" position in the South on racial matters, the identification of articulate social scientists and educators with the cause of equalitarian race relations. It would be difficult to maintain that the role of expert and interpreter discharged by leading figures of the social science and educational fields — and shared to some extent by their larger professional groups—has been directly determinative of the major changes in social policy which have occurred. But certainly the contribution of a body of pertinent knowledge, through research, writing and discussion, has helped to establish and broaden communication on the important issues. Insofar as communication is an integrative and socializing principle, it produces greater intimacy and understanding of

indiv
Robert
substit
ships
non-so
of sou
tors, l
and de

To l
cators
the So
ly that
in the
finding
scienti
sented
school
the soc
format
power
hands.

role, a
imple
ly by
region
of con
ion re
have
southe
similar
the in
social
related
identit
nicatio
social
plines,
ticipan
larger
the fr
ideolog
accepte

This
tions o
educat
as the
tion.
white
is dou
group
by the
other
qualifi
siderat
Insofa

individuated groups in the society, as Robert E. Park suggests, and tends to substitute a moral order for relationships that are basically symbiotic and non-social. (6) In this sense, the role of southern social scientists and educators, however lacking in unanimity and decisiveness, has been important.

To be sure, social scientists and educators of the South are not makers of the South's social policy; nor is it likely that they will assume this function in the immediate future. When the findings and expert opinions of social scientists were employed in briefs presented to the Supreme Court on the school segregation cases, direct use of the social scientist as an aid to policy-formation was made, although the power of decision remained in other hands. (1). But participation in this role, as well as its organization and implementation, was undertaken largely by scholars outside the southern region. It is doubtful that the degree of commitment and disciplined opinion represented in this action would have been possible by a group of southern social scientists acting in a similar role. Here it is apparent that the interests of Negro and white social scientists of the South, though related, have not been, in the main, identical. Thus, even though communication has taken place within the social science and educational disciplines, between Negro and white participants and through them to the larger public, it has been largely at the fringes of the equalitarian racial ideology and not in terms of a fully-accepted value premise.

This illustrates one of the limitations of the role of expert by southern educators and social scientists, as well as the more basic communicating function. The orientation of Negro and white educators and social scientists is doubtlessly somewhat different; one group accepting and being motivated by the equalitarian ideology, and the other accepting the ideology with qualifications based upon status considerations, expediencies and tradition. Insofar as the communicating process

is concerned, this somewhat dissociated orientation is not too serious, for the process can proceed in spite of it. But, with respect to the role of expert and adviser on the practical aspects of school desegregation, the implications are more serious.

At this juncture the question of goals is crucial — desegregation and the ultimate ideal of racial integration. In this initial stage of readjustment, the matter resolves into a question of *how* changes are to be effected, and there is a tendency for the methods proposed to be subjugated to goals not fully consonant with equalitarian ideology. The present debate over gradual versus immediate methods of change, it would appear, is essentially a difference in orientation as to goals, having only secondary relevance either to practical considerations or the potentialities of human adaptability to social change. Many proposals are, in effect, an effort to qualify the desegregation process in such a way as to assure that the racial prestige and status system remains relatively unaltered. There appears to be an inclination for Negro spokesman to underestimate the difficulties of change and for the white "liberal," including educators and social scientists, to over-emphasize the difficulties. Where within these extremes of orientation does social reality and approximate truth lie? It is presumably this dimension which is the domain of the expert, upon which proposals and even predictions are made.

Southern educators and social scientists, insofar as they may be characterized as a group, probably approximate Merton's type of orientation designated as the "fair weather liberal." (5) This is a strategic group promising the largest returns for the least effort, according to Merton, for it is amenable to co-operation. It is nevertheless a group highly responsive to factors of expediency. Now that the Supreme Court decision has been made, saying that public school segregation is unconstitutional and clearly enunciating national public policy, it

is likely that differences as to goals and objectives of change will tend to lessen. The effect would be to create greater unanimity within this segment of the South's citizenry, although expediences will continue to dictate the positions taken on specific and local instances of policy. On the whole, it may be expected that implementing orders by the Court will reduce further the element of expediency and the lack of common orientation — but only if such orders are specific in nature and do not permit a wide latitude of error and deliberate distortion in application.

Once the policy objectives are made clear by the Supreme Court through implementing decrees, the major task to be performed is essentially one of social planning. Planning has been described as the application of intelligence to changing circumstances and changing conceptions of need, with the role of the expert being that of assessing the practicability of objectives and providing techniques for shaping and administering plans. (3) In order to serve this role as an aid to the planning process, southern educators will need to expand the body of knowledge which can be potentially useful. It seems obvious that many of the older generalizations, partly empirically-derived and partly adduced from personal experience, no longer hold, for they were arrived at from definitions of the problem which related more to custom and tradition than to the dynamics of social change and human plasticity. However, if such a role is to be effective in facilitating the school desegregation process, it will be important to insure that planning is democratic. That is to say, the role of the expert performed by educators and social scientists, along with the body of knowledge they develop, should not be made instruments of the power and political systems of control. Furthermore, it will be necessary for Negro educators and social scientists to share the functions of the expert and strate-

gic communicators on an equal basis with others in the actual conduct of planning. Otherwise, the dangers of partisan and controlled planning will be maximized. The same would be true of research efforts which are designed to provide important clues to practical problems of effecting change. In a matter already heavily vested with partisan and political interests, this would seem to be an essential. If new and useful insights are to come, the nature and kind of research undertaken will be crucial. A fundamental consideration in this respect, of course, is the organization and financing of such research and investigative programs.

Who will undertake the research and what will be its auspices? To what practical problems will it be addressed and who will participate in defining such problems? What basic policies underlie the proposed undertakings? What efforts will be made to control or counterbalance the somewhat divergent orientations and biases of Negro and white social scientists and educators in conducting the research and arriving at practical conclusions therefrom?

These, it would appear are important questions to ask; for the way they are resolved will in a large part determine whether southern educators and social scientists are to be employed as political instruments or as relatively independent technologists facilitating the school desegregation program. Considerations such as these directly confront the major foundations which are interested in supporting research to aid the desegregation process. They would seem to require a definite answer in policy, if foundation resources are likewise to serve a socially-useful purpose consistent with the Supreme Court decision. Similar research efforts, organized and supported through state auspices—legislatures, state and local boards of education, and similar agencies — require a scrutiny in terms of these considerations, even more vigorously applied.

1. Cla
Apprai
cial 115
2. Da
sion, (1
1945)
3. Fre
Landco
M., Pr
Henry

VAN
OF

The
which
inquir
ties fa
from
school
it take
the m
These
lated
cussed
The
in the
it is a
If the
vorabl
would
given
segreg
all un
lem c
take a
were.
likely
stance
of the
is to
an ap
The
into e
acteri
kind
which
cation
his of

REFERENCES

1. Clark, Kenneth B., "Desegregation: An Appraisal of the Evidence," *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. IX, No. 4 (1953).
2. Davidson, Donald, "Preface to Decision," *The Sewanee Review*, 53 (Summer, 1945) 394-413.
3. Freedman, Ronald; Hawley, Amos H.; Landecker, Werner S.; and Miner, Horace M., *Principles of Sociology*, New York: Henry Holt and Company, pp. 622-630.
4. Johnson, Charles S., *To Stem This Tide: A Survey of Racial Tension Areas in the United States*, Boston: The Pilgrim Press.
5. Merton, Robert K., "Discrimination and the American Creed," in *Discrimination and the National Welfare*, R. M. MacIver (Ed.), New York: Harper and Brothers, p. 106.
6. Park, Robert E., *Race and Culture*, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, pp. 40-43.

VARIABLES AFFECTING THE SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT OF NEGRO CHILDREN IN NON-SEGREGATED SCHOOLS

RICHARD L. PLAUT

National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students

The first of the two questions which I have been asked to discuss, inquires about the scholastic difficulties facing Negro students in moving from segregated to non-segregated schools; the second asks how long will it take them, on the average, to make the necessary scholastic adjustment. These two questions are so closely related that they can more easily be discussed together.

There is one common denominator in the answers to both questions and it is an overriding one: the variables. If these variable factors were all favorable for Jim or Susan, the answers would be that "no importance need be given to the effects of his previously segregated schooling." If they were all unfavorable, the adjustment problem could be extremely difficult and take a long time to resolve, if it ever were. Since these two extremes are likely to be rare and since in most instances there will be varying mixtures of the variable factors, the first step is to describe them and assign to each an appropriate degree of importance.

The variables break down readily into each student's own personal characteristics, attitudes, and capacities, the kind of family and community in which he has grown up, and the educational and social climates of both his old and his new schools. Perhaps

the most prevailing variable of all is at what age his change of schools takes place.

It seems almost too obvious that the change for an eight year old child finishing the second grade presents relatively no problem at all compared with that faced by the sixteen year old going from the tenth grade in a segregated school to the eleventh in a non-segregated one. Obvious, but so significant that it could cut across all other variable currents and, in many instances, become the prevailing wind.

The most important variant in the student himself is his own intellectual ability and emotional stability.

The bright child should have little trouble meeting stiffer class-room competition, higher scholastic standards, and just finding out how to use such strange learning facilities as libraries and laboratories. Many of the modern shiny brick, glass, and stainless steel southern schools, built for Negroes in the recent frantic effort to approach the separate but equal formula, have generous library and laboratory space without a single book or bunsen burner.

The emotionally stable child will face the new situation with more security and less tension and anxiety with which to compensate, if necessary, for less scholastic aptitude.

The combination of both intellectual ability and emotional stability is virtually unbeatable.

The Negro family's attitudes towards whites, in general, and integrated schools in particular, will strongly affect the child's adjustment. If the family has a good parent-teacher relationship with white teachers, the child is likely to also. If parents have no manifest hostility towards whites, neither in all likelihood, will the children.

In a recently desegregated school in a border state city, there is a tragic illustration of the potential destructiveness of parents with fanatical racial attitudes. In the current desegregation process in this city, the enrollment of an all-white school became about two-thirds white and one-third Negro, a rare and rather ideal mixture. Among the Negro transferees was a girl who came into her senior year in September 1954 with an "A" record which she continued to maintain in the new school. Her measured scholastic aptitude was "high superior" and she was described as "attractive and charming." In October the mixed senior class elected her president. Between October and January the following events took place in sequence: 1. her parents refused to allow her to accept the class presidency; 2. her parents also refused to allow her to complete applications to inter-racial colleges (both actions on the stated grounds that "she was not trustworthy"); 3. in November, she had a nervous breakdown; 4. in December, she was withdrawn from school entirely and did not return at the end of the Christmas holidays. The purpose of telling this story is not to reaffirm the obvious, that parents can be wantonly destructive, but rather to point out that the destructiveness of these particular parents apparently never affected their child's progress until desegregation forced their hostility towards whites into overt action.

Children from culturally and eco-

nomically deprived homes always find scholastic achievement more difficult. Cultural advantages in the home and the economic advantages, from which they more often stem than not, can compensate in scholastic achievement for as much as a twenty to thirty point difference in I.Q. Children from advantaged homes are helped scholastically in a number of ways: first in increased verbal ability just from hearing good English spoken at home and in having books in the house and parents who read them; secondly from a family tradition and a respect for education, perhaps the most powerful single factor affecting scholastic motivation. These motivational forces at home are bound to play an important role in the relative scholastic achievement of Negro children from culturally and economically deprived homes, when they are mixed with a larger group, whose families, on the whole, are more advantaged.

The community climate will be a variable and affecting factor. In such border-state cities as Louisville, Baltimore, St. Louis, and Kansas City, there are already established lines of communication between Negroes and whites; there are often mixed scout troops, mixed campus, and peripheral neighborhoods in which whites and Negroes are not only neighbors but sometimes friendly neighbors. In these cities, the new school situation will be neither as strange nor as difficult to adjust to as farther South where the only inter-racial communication is on a superior-inferior basis or, as in rural areas, where any social change is likely to provoke hostility.

The schools are variable factors. The relative quality of instruction and curricular strength in the formerly segregated and the newly desegregated schools will be important in the scholastic achievement of the students moving between them. As Ashmore (1) points out, the Negro-white school "gap" in the South is not so great as the rural-urban "gap." The transition from any given segregated

school can be all. The difference is from from integrated measures courage less the lege p proportion in 1954 veiled from which of the only those lege a quirem prepar upper causes, motiva absence found Other lege at scholar quate ling. The town, South. fer: it as likely goes cording out of mostly of char ing by cent, a ing of On t number the ne present since in the sch May 1

school to another non-segregated one can mean a big jump or no jump at all. In the same way the relative levels of faculty-student aspiration can differ widely, or not at all, with different schools.

Some assumptions may be drawn from the achievement of Negroes in integrated northern schools, which measured statistically, has not been encouraging. Negroes still constitute less than 1% of our inter-racial college population, far fewer than their proportion of the general population. In 1953, Ferguson and Plaut (2) surveyed forty large urban high schools from New England to Illinois, in which Negroes constituted one third of the senior class enrollments but only one-fourth of one per cent of those who had fulfilled minimum college admission and scholarship requirements, i.e., had taken the college preparatory course and ranked in the upper quartile of their classes. The causes, of course, stem from under-motivation, under-aspiration, and the absence of an educational tradition found in less advantaged homes. Other causes are ignorance about college attitudes towards Negroes, about scholarship opportunities, and inadequate and often stereotyped counseling.

The point is that all of these factors, but one, also prevail in the South. Only the counselling may differ: it is equally inadequate but not as likely to be stereotyped, when Negroes counsel Negro students. Accordingly, one variable factor growing out of desegregation and perhaps mostly negative, will be the incidence of change from insufficient counselling by Negroes of Negroes to insufficient, as well as stereotyped counselling of Negroes by whites.

On the other hand, there will be a number of positive variables found in the newly desegregated school, not present in the northern school, long since integrated. In virtually all of the schools desegregated since the May 17th decision, integration has

taken place on both student and faculty levels. Since almost every southern state has boasted, probably accurately, that it employs more Negro teachers than all of the thirty-one northern states combined, there will be many more Negro teachers in mixed southern schools than in their northern counterparts. This will give Negro children not only a greater sense of security but a chance to identify themselves with the man or woman in the leadership role. The sights and, accordingly, the achievement of Negro children should thus be raised.

In most of these already desegregated school systems, special workshops and training courses in human relations and race relations have been established for both white and Negro teachers and counsellors. There is a general awareness in the schools and in the community that desegregation offers both a problem and a challenge. This should result in a general uplift in morale. One might say that northern students are being deprived of the uplift of desegregation.

A summary of the variables involved in answering these two questions would, therefore, stipulate that little or no "importance need be given to the effects of previous segregated schooling on the level of the academic achievement of Negro students" and it would take them no time at all "to overcome the handicaps of segregated schooling," when the following factors, in the approximate order of their importance, are present:

- I. If the child has
 - a) intellectual ability
 - b) emotional stability
- II. If the family
 - a) relates well to whites
 - b) is not too culturally and economically deprived
- III. If the community already has lines of communication between Negroes and whites.

IV. If the segregated school had a relatively

- a) high quality of instruction
- b) strong curriculum
- c) high level of faculty-student aspiration

V. If the desegregated school has

- a) some Negro teachers
- b) some Negro counselors
- c) human relations training and workshops for joint white and Negro faculty, as well as parents.

As any of these factors vary negatively, the adjustment problem will become more difficult and take longer.

So much for the theoretical! In looking for empirical evidence, the most recently desegregated school systems above the Mason-Dixon line in New Jersey, Indiana, Illinois, and Arizona offer little. In the first place, in the most recent and comprehensive study of these systems, "Schools in Transition", Williams and Ryan (3), do not touch upon the relative scholastic achievement of the Negro students involved. Secondly, if the evidence were available, it would not differ markedly from that found in the northern schools which have been mixed for decades. There have not been enough Negro teachers and counselors, special teacher training, and other uplifting influences typical of recent border state desegregation, in "north of the line" desegregation.

Perhaps the best empirical evidence is to be found in the files of the National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students which has been largely responsible for moving, in the past several years, at least one hundred boys and girls from segregated junior and senior high schools to top-ranking New England preparatory schools, as well as over four hundred high school seniors from segregated schools to predominantly white colleges mostly in the North and, more recently, in the South as well.

In considering this evidence, it must be recognized that, to begin with, these were highly select groups of students. They had to be to win acceptance and, in most cases, large competitive scholarship awards at leading private schools and colleges. Many of their transition problems were the same as for less select groups, however, and, though they were select, so were all of the schools and most of the colleges in which they had to achieve and adjust.

Some of the boys who went to preparatory schools with the highest academic standards, such as Andover, Exeter, Groton, and Hotchkiss had to drop back one grade but so have some boys, both white and Negro, transferring from northern public schools to private schools. Others had to spend one summer at summer session but this has also been true of northern students. On the whole, the preparatory school records of these students from the segregated schools have been outstanding. Only about 20% of them were in the class of 1954 or earlier, but, of those who were, none have failed to graduate for scholastic deficiency or social maladjustment; one or two were withdrawn by their parents before graduation for financial reasons. A large majority were graduated in the top half of their classes; quite a few, in the top quarter. All of those graduating won large enough scholarships to meet their needs at colleges of their first, second, or third choice. Most of them had or are having extra-curricular records ranging from good to outstanding.

To repeat, this is a highly select group which had been carefully screened, first by NSSFNS and then by the school, for intellectual ability and a stable family background. Most of them, but by no means all, came from the best segregated schools in Washington and Baltimore. They were no more superior, however, to the average segregated school student than the schools to which they went

are academically superior to the average white southern high school.

Many of those who did not drop back a grade had a hard time in their first semester, some for their whole first year, but virtually all of them found their second year smooth sailing. Another common denominator was the high correlation between grade level at the time of transfer and getting over the hump. Those who enrolled in preparatory school in the ninth grade found the catching up period shorter and easier than those who started in the tenth grade. The eleventh grade transfers seemed to have had the hardest time. There were no twelfth grade transfers but those who took a post-graduate year at preparatory school had little trouble and vastly improved their college admission and scholarship opportunities.

The group of several hundred students who have entered non-segregated colleges from segregated schools with NSSFNS help is also a select group in that all of them survived both NSSFNS and college screening for admission, many of them won college scholarships, and, of these, most were awarded supplementary financial aid by NSSFNS. The high quality of the group, however, is more than compensated for by the magnitude of their financial problems, the poor quality of their secondary school preparation, and the adjustment they have had to make from a life-long segregated environment to a totally strange environment in which they constituted, in most cases, a small racial minority.

At least as large a proportion of these students as in the total college population, are surviving in college. Their attrition rate at the end of freshman year, when by far the largest proportion drop out, has been less than one-third; through senior year, not over 40%. Wolfe (4) estimates that under 60% of all students who enter college go on to graduate.

The mortality rate has been lowest, strangely enough, in the colleges with the highest academic standards; highest in colleges with the lowest standards. The academic achievement of the surviving students of the NSSFNS group covers the whole gamut from high honors to hanging on by their teeth. Their extra-curricular achievements range from student government presidents and varsity team captains to virtually none at all; their campus citizenship from outstanding to mediocre.

The experience with these two groups seems to affirm the initial hypotheses drawn earlier: that the importance of problems of scholastic achievement for Negro students involved in desegregation will vary, chiefly with the individual family, community, and school climate. Most of the students who will catch up at all will do it by the end of their first year in the new school situation. Some never will, but, then, neither do some white students. The achievement problems involved in the changeover are not racial problems at all. They are intellectual, emotional, educational, and socio-economic. The students with enough of these variable factors in their favor will catch up fast enough; those with too many against them, like their less advantaged white counterparts, would have lagged behind under any system.

REFERENCES

1. Harry S. Ashmore, *The Negro and the Schools*, Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1954, Chapter XI.
2. Harold A. Ferguson and Richard L. Plaut, "Talent: To Develop or To Lose," *The Educational Record*, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1954, pp. 137-140.
3. Robin M. Williams, Jr. and Margaret W. Ryan, *Schools in Transition*, Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1955, pp. 61-62.
4. Dael Wolfe, *America's Resources of Specialized Talent*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954, pp. 148-9, p. 312.

PROTESTANT CHURCHES AND PUBLIC SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

J. OSCAR LEE

*National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States
of America*

It is difficult to assess the role of institutions or even of methods in bringing about social change. This is true regarding the role of the Protestant churches in the process of desegregating the public schools. Protestant churches, like other social institutions, are involved in and affected by the processes which have resulted in the movement from a segregated society to a non-segregated one. More specifically, many Protestant churches and church organizations have aided in creating a climate of opinion; participated in community action and initiated policies, organizational patterns, and practices within their own structures which have facilitated movement toward desegregation and integration.

For a long period the Protestant churches have been active in the effort to develop race relationships which would be more expressive of the Christian ideals of love and justice. There was a period when much of this effort appears to have been toward the realization of a larger degree of justice within the existing social pattern of racial segregation. Within the past two decades, however, the major emphasis has shifted to an attack on the pattern of racial segregation itself as incompatible with Christian principle. In 1946, The Federal Council of Churches renounced "the pattern of segregation in race relations as unnecessary and undesirable and a violation of the Gospel of love and human brotherhood." (2) Many Protestant denominational groups both prior and subsequent to 1946 have issued statements setting forth similar positions. (4) A statement renouncing the pattern of segregation issued in 1952, by the National Council of Churches contains these sentences:

"Above all, the principle of segregation is a denial of the Christian faith and ethic which stems from the basic premise taught by our Lord that all men are created the children of God. The pattern of segregation is diametrically opposed to what Christians believe about the worth of persons and if we are to be true to the Christian faith we must take our stand against it." (3)

The policy positions of these denominational and interdenominational organizations renouncing racial segregation are known to many church groups. Literally hundreds of Protestant religious periodicals, conferences and local church groups have discussed on many occasions the operation and effect of racial segregation both in the churches and in various aspects of community life. In addition, church groups have produced and distributed pamphlets, books, films and filmstrips dealing with this issue. Much of this material contains specific suggestions on how churches and church people can engage in social action to eliminate racial segregation both in the community and in the churches themselves. (1; 8)

These processes have created a new climate of opinion in the churches and they have in turn, contributed to the climate of opinion which is making possible the elimination of segregation from various aspects of community life. For instance, it has been pointed out that many proponents of racial segregation no longer attempt to justify their position on the basis of Christian principle. Increasingly their arguments appear to be based on considerations of social expediency. Also there is rather general recognition on the part of the church membership

that the churches have lagged in dealing with the pattern of racial segregation. In many quarters this recognition is serving as a stimulus to more forthright action. (3) This is resulting in increased efforts to adjust the denominational practices as well as those of theological seminaries, camps, conference grounds and many other church-related organizations to facilitate desegregation and integration within church organizations. (6)

An illustration of this type of adjustment by a denomination is the fact that the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church has changed its name to the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church, thereby eliminating a racial designation in its name. Along with this, the denomination has committed itself to "the principal and practice of inclusiveness in membership, and membership participation without racial or color discrimination." Also many local churches are serving persons on a racially inclusive basis as members of the congregation and/or as participants in the church program. In addition there are an increasing number of local churches in the process of achieving this type of service. (7)

The churches have been involved in the movement to desegregate the public schools. Church groups have issued statements supporting the Supreme Court decision regarding segregation in the public school. (9) Ministers have read these statements from their pulpits and preached sermons supporting desegregation of the public schools. They have discussed the issue with community leaders both individually and in groups. In these discussions they have indicated the responsibility which confronts school boards and public officials to formulate clear and affirmative policy and procedure for accomplishing desegregation and integration of the schools. Religious periodicals have devoted much space to discussion of the issue and pamphlets, leaflets and mimeographed material have been published. National and regional church groups,

interracial in composition, have discussed the problems involved and have urged their local church groups to work on the issue. Many local church groups have developed study-action groups in which they have sought to develop a pattern of action by which desegregation could be accomplished in their communities. Local ministers' associations have held conferences with public officials and other community leaders on the issue. Individual church members have participated as representatives of church groups and as individuals in cooperative community efforts designed to deal with the situation on a community-wide basis.

Possibly two instances out of many reports describing the activities of church groups will serve the purposes of this paper.

The Religious News Service (January 21, 1955) reported the formation of a church sponsored group at Chapel Hill, North Carolina, called the Interracial Fellowship for the Schools, to consider how that community might implement the Supreme Court's decision regarding the elimination of segregation in the public schools. The group is sponsored by the Chapel Hill Ministerial Association which includes more than fifty white and Negro members.

In Rock Hill, South Carolina, a Catholic priest, several Protestant ministers and the president of the Jewish congregation initiated a significant community movement as a result of informal conversations among themselves and with other community leaders about the problems involved in desegregation of the public schools. A Human Relations Commission was set up by the City Council. The members, which included both Negroes and white people, were appointed by the Mayor. The task of this commission is to deal with the problems of intergroup relations in that community.

Recent newspaper reports have called attention to the fact that at

Birmingham, Alabama, a group of Methodist ministers and laymen formed an organization called the "Association of Methodist Ministers and Laymen." The main objective of the organization is the preservation of the Central Jurisdiction which includes the majority of Negro ministers and members in the Methodist Church. This group of about two hundred and fifty white persons reportedly coming from five southern states took issue with the statement issued by the Methodist Council of Bishops at its November (1954) meeting which challenged Methodists to give leadership in support of the "principles involved in the action of the Court." This type of opposition has not crystallized in the Methodist Church or in other denominations in other areas of the country.

The more significant differences appear to be in the attitudes of Southern people regarding the decision. We must recognize that there is a group of people in the churches of the South who oppose the acceptance of the Supreme Court decision. On the other hand, a large number of regional, state and local church organizations in the area have issued statements commending the decision. These statements reflect the fact that there is a sizeable group of people in the Methodist Church and in other denominations who support the decision and who have committed themselves to work for its implementation. These people are asking questions about how to accomplish implementation, such as: Where do we begin? How fast can it be done? How can you control the "hotheads," both those for desegregation and those against it?

There are two other groupings to which attention must be given. The first group is composed of people who are favorable in attitude to the decision, but who cannot be depended upon to do anything about implementing it. The second group includes those people who, while they accept segregation in the public schools as

the existing pattern of conduct, are un-committed in their attitude regarding the decision.

There is increasing recognition by the churches of the fact that racial segregation in housing is a considerable obstacle in achieving desegregation and integration in the public schools. The prospect is that the church programs of social education and action will place increased emphasis on the elimination of segregation in housing.

CONCLUSION

The churches have been affected by the movement from a segregated society to a non-segregated one. This is reflected in the adjustment of their own policies, organizational patterns and practices to facilitate desegregation both in the churches and in the community. Effective education is taking place even among those who oppose the movement. Many church groups have been involved in activities to desegregate the public schools. They realize that they have a real responsibility to share along with other community agencies in the task of moving toward the goal so clearly defined by the Supreme Court decision. They recognize also that the total resources of the community must be employed to achieve this goal.

REFERENCES

1. Brethern — *Dwell Together in Unity. A Message for Race Relations Sunday, February 13, 1955 from the National Council of Churches*, New York: Publication and Distribution Department, National Council of Churches, 1955.
2. *The Churches and Race Relations*, New York: Department of Race Relations, Federal Council of Churches, 1946, p. 5.
3. *The Churches and Segregation*, New York: Department of Racial and Cultural Relations, The National Council of Churches, 1952, p. 5.
4. *Denominational Statements with Reference to a Racially Inclusive Fellowship*, Department of Racial and Cultural Relations, National Council of Churches, (October, 1954), pp. 1-27.
5. Alfred S. Kramer, "Racial Integration in Three Protestant Denominations," *Journal of Education Sociology*, 8 (October, 1954), pp. 59-69.

6. J. C. Integrating Journal (1954),

7. J. C. About York:

On States fifty-o doctrine that " (that) Segreg inheren toric c inevit proven the al minist the D reorga that ra ing f In all be the of leg tion i well a ican f nitude social (8) Rac accept only in III well.

* Se sas, D Louisi North Tennes tract school Kansas

6. J. Oscar Lee, "The Status of Racial Relations, National Council of Churches, Integration in Religious Institutions," (January, 1955).
7. J. Oscar Lee and Alfred S. Kramer, "The Status of Racial Relations, National Council of Churches, Integration in Religious Institutions," *Journal of Negro Education*, 23 (Summer, 1954), 231-241.
8. "Segregation on Sunday?" *Social Progress*, XLX (January, 1955), 1-48.
9. *Statements Adopted by Religious Groups*, New York: Department of Racial and Cultural Relations, National Council of Churches (October, 1954), pp. 1-31.

LEGAL BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MAY 17th DECISION

ROBERT L. CARTER

National Association for The Advancement of Colored People

I.

On May 17, 1954, the United States Supreme Court swept away the fifty-odd year old "separate but equal" doctrine with the simple statement that "in the field of public education (that) doctrine . . . has no place. Segregated educational facilities are inherently unequal." (5) This historic decision will have as its almost inevitable consequence the greatest improvement in the Negro's status since the abolition of slavery. School administrators in twenty-one states and the District of Columbia must now reorganize the public school system so that race will no longer be a determining factor in school attendance.* In all probability this decision will be the key to the complete elimination of legally supported racial discrimination in all walks of life—north as well as south. If any change in American folkways and mores of this magnitude takes place even in part, the social consequences will be staggering. (8)

Racial segregation has become an accepted American tradition — not only in Georgia and Mississippi but in Illinois, New York and Ohio as well. This has been so, at least, since

permitted segregation if local authorities desired it.

1896 when the United States Supreme Court in *Plessy v. Ferguson* (10) held that the Constitution permitted a state to enforce a policy of racial segregation as long as the facilities provided for Negroes were equal to those available to white persons. On May 17th the Court said there could be no racial segregation in public education, and one is tempted to view this decision as a sharp and even radical break with legal precedent. Closer examination, however, will reveal this decision as simply another step in the formulation and development of a constitutional doctrine, the seeds of which had been planted at least as long ago as 1938.

If we were to examine conditions in 1935, we would find flagrant inequalities at every level of the educational process with respect to "separate but equal" facilities for Negroes. (1) While abjectly inferior, segregated facilities for the elementary, secondary and college education of Negroes were actually provided. In the segregating states there were no institutions where a Negro could continue his education beyond these levels. If by some chance he desired to attend a graduate or professional school, he was eligible for out-of-state scholarship aid. This was a grant of state funds — usually equivalent to tuition — to enable Negroes to attend institution outside of the segregating states which would accept their applications.

The out-of-state scholarship program had the practical advantage of saving millions of dollars in public

* Seventeen States — Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia — and the District of Columbia made segregation in schools mandatory. Four states — Arizona, Kansas, New Mexico and Wyoming —

monies which might otherwise have to be expended in the development of an "equal" Negro university. The program was warmly defended by its supporters as sensible, practical and highly realistic. The number of Negroes desiring this kind of training was unquestionably too small to warrant the vast expenditure of state funds which would be required if the Negro college were to be expanded to a point that it could offer training at every level available at the state university. The obvious solution, of course, was to admit Negro students to the state university to pursue courses not offered at the segregated college. This simple solution, however, would crack the wall of segregation, which all seventeen states were then resolutely committed to maintaining at all costs. The out-of-state scholarship plan seemed the way out. The Negro student was getting the training he wanted with state help, and it was the only way the states could afford to maintain segregation beyond the college level.

From its very inception, "separate but equal" was a satisfactory constitutional premise to the proponents of segregation, only because it was generally felt that the courts would not seek to enforce more than token compliance with the condition that equal facilities be provided. While educational facilities for Negroes were not comparable to those provided for white students, it was expected that controversy centering around such disparities would be settled without strain to segregation itself.

True, in 1936 Maryland's highest court had ordered the admission of a Negro to the University on the ground that there was no authority for his exclusion under state law. (4) If any such defect existed in the other states, conceivably it could easily be remedied.

Then, in 1938, the United States Supreme Court shocked the South out of its complacency. It held in *Missouri ex rel Gaines v. Canada*, (11) that racial segregation could not be en-

forced under state law unless equal facilities were actually available to Negroes within the state. By this decision, the Court served notice that if segregation was to be maintained, more than lip service would have to be given to the "equal" phrase of the formula. While no affirmative order was issued requiring that Gaines be admitted to the University of Missouri, it was clear, by implication at least, that unless a "substantially equal" law school for Negroes was established, Gaines and other Negroes would have to be admitted to the University of Missouri.

Although not fully foreseen at the time, this really marked the beginning of the end of segregation in public education pursuant to constitutional sanction. The requirement that segregation could be maintained only on condition that equal facilities exist made the May 17th decision all but inevitable. The Court made it clear that "equal facilities" in being were the indispensable prerequisite to the Fourteenth Amendment's sanction of segregation. Necessarily, the Court must now define what this requirement entailed. When the Court undertook this task, the apparent sacrosanct and inviolate character of segregation was fatally compromised. It was now possible, although inconceivable in 1938, for segregation to be defined as a denial of "equal facilities."

Full exploitation of this decision was frustrated by the disappearance of Lloyd Gaines,* and for a long period following the *Gaines* case there was a dearth of litigation concerning equal educational opportunities for Negroes. In the interim came the war which placed America's treatment of Negroes in the critical glare of world attention. The slogans used, the very nature of the war, and the great sacrifice required of all made

* This is a mystery which has never been solved. After the Supreme Court decision, Gaines disappeared from Missouri. There are many rumors about what happened but nothing reliable about Gaines' whereabouts.

Negroes
bitter
against
creatin
and g
problem

Amo
the wa
on per
ing on
tions v
which
Court.
to pla
Japan
emerge
after
Court.
langua
Americ
cial dis
that it
gerous
of loy

Afte
equal c
was re
aim of
tion of
these
Oklahe
law at
In spi
had be
of Ne
refuse
Oklahe
preme
posed
(7)
were
facilit
facilit
sons.
Court
its har
not to
state
Negro
tunitie

Two
decisi
ing en
uate a
cases—

Negroes increasingly restive and embittered about the racial barriers against them, and white persons increasingly embarrassed, self conscious, and guilt ridden about the "Negro problem."

Among the unhappy products of the war were the restrictions imposed on persons of Japanese ancestry residing on the West Coast. These restrictions were tested in a series of cases which ultimately reached the Supreme Court.⁽³⁾ While the Army's power to place restrictions on persons of Japanese ancestry was upheld as an emergency war measure, it was only after much soul-searching by the Court. In all of these cases there is language in eloquent expression of America's fundamental aversion to racial discrimination. Yet the Court felt that it could not strike down the dangerous precedent of a racial criterion of loyalty.

After the war litigation to secure equal educational facilities for Negroes was resumed, but now the declared aim of these test cases was the destruction of segregation itself. The first of these involved a young woman from Oklahoma City who wanted to study law at the University of Oklahoma. In spite of the fact that no provision had been made for the legal training of Negroes, Ada Lois Sipuel was refused admission to the University of Oklahoma. The case reached the Supreme Court in 1948 and was disposed of with unprecedented speed.⁽⁷⁾ The Court held that Negroes were entitled to equal educational facilities and at the same time such facilities were available to white persons. Perhaps, more importantly, the Court made it unmistakably evident in its handling of this case that it would not tolerate a cavalier approach by a state to the constitutional right of Negroes to equal educational opportunities.

Two years later came two crucial decisions which came close to outlawing enforced segregation in state graduate and professional schools. In these cases—*Sweatt v. Painter* (12) and *Mc-*

Laurin v. Oklahoma State Regents (13) in determining what constituted "equal facilities," the Court made it clear that it was no longer considering merely tangible facilities, such as curricular offerings, buildings, library holdings, size of faculty, etc. Indeed, in the *Sweatt* case, in finding the law school for Negroes inferior to the school of law of the University of Texas the greatest stress was placed on the intangibles — reputation of faculty, position and influence of alumni, traditions and prestige. And even though *McLaurin* was admitted to the same classroom, had the same books and the same teachers, the fact that he was segregated from the rest of the student body was found to impair and inhibit his ability to study and learn his profession.

Taken together these decisions meant that for all practical purposes legally enforced segregation in graduate and professional schools was now impossible. (9) In short order all of the state universities in the South, with the exception of state universities in South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi and Florida and many private universities opened their doors to Negroes.*

The next cases to reach the Court were the *School Segregation Cases* in which the "separate but equal" doctrine was repudiated. Already fully committed in *Sweatt* and *McLaurin* to the proposition that equality in education could not be measured by tangible factors alone, the logical next step was for the Court to consider racial segregation in the light of its impact on the individual. In taking this step the Court found the segregation of children "from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone." Thus, the "separate but

* Cases are pending in Alabama and Florida for admission of Negroes to the state universities.

equal" doctrine in education was finished as a constitutional yardstick on May 17th, but it had been doomed since 1938.

II.

It is hard to predict the future development of a constitutional theory. Constitutional law does not proceed with certain and undeviating logic from one milestone to the next. One of the major tasks of courts deciding questions of constitutional law is to accommodate competing and conflicting interests in our society, and a great deal of give and take must be involved. Courts cannot withdraw to ivory towers and adjudicate in the field of public law on the basis of abstractions without regard to how their decisions may affect the fortunes and hopes of real people. Predictions, therefore, should not be hazarded. Yet, it does seem safe to predict that eventually the Constitution will be construed as proscribing the enforcement of racial distinctions in any field pursuant to public authority. Of course, the pace of such extension of the May 17th doctrine rests in the judgment and discretion of the Supreme Court. (6)

What may be evidence of a trend was a decision by the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit on March 14, 1955, in two cases involving the legality of segregation at publicly owned and operated swimming and beach facilities near Baltimore, Maryland. (2) In a *per curiam* opinion the Court held that the decision of May 17, 1954 had "swept away" the "separate but equal" doctrine, and that as a consequence "it is obvious that racial segregation in recreational activities can no longer be sustained as a proper exercise of the police power of the state." The sweep of this terse opinion seemingly indicates that that Court is convinced that "separate but equal" is no longer an appropriate constitutional yardstick in any area. Rather it seems to take the view that racial distinctions must now be measured like any other legislative classification, and as such they are val-

id only if based upon a real difference pertinent to a lawful governmental objective. Under such a standard, all racial distinctions would fall. This decision is far reaching, but only the Supreme Court can say whether it is willing to go that far at this time. The Court of Appeals, however, gives voice to the generally accepted belief that the May 17th decision marked the end of the "separate but equal" doctrine, and the next several years should evidence some startling gains for democracy in race relations as communities and individuals begin to act in accord with the Supreme Court's pronouncement and seek to show that segregation has no place in American life.

REFERENCES

1. The discrepancies today are equally depressing. See Ashmore, *The Negro and the Schools*, Part II (1954); Blose and Jarac, *Biennial Survey of Education in the United States*, 1948-1950, Table 43, *Statistics of State School Systems*, 1949-1950 (1952).
2. *Dawson v. Mayor and City Council*, F2d — (CA 4th decided March 14, 1955).
3. The cases which reached the Supreme Court were *Hirabayashi v. United States*, 320 U. S. 81 (1943); *Korematsu v. United States*, 323 U. S. 214 (1944); *Ex parte Endo*, 323 U. S. 283 (1944). In 1949, in *Acheson v. Murakami*, 176 F2d 953, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit had occasion to review the relocation program which it bitterly condemns as inspired more by false race dogma than by danger of sabotage. See particularly pp. 957-958.
4. *Pearson v. Murray*, 169 Md. 478, 182A 540 (1936) was the first successful litigation to secure the admission of a Negro to a state university of one of the segregating states. Donald Murray wanted to study law and applied to the law school of the University of Maryland. There was no other law school in the state supported out of state funds. Murray was refused admission on the grounds that the state law requiring segregation of the races forbade his attendance at the University of Maryland. The Maryland highest state court ruled that the state law did not bar Murray's admission to the University of Maryland, and he was admitted. Since the decision was based solely on an interpretation of Maryland law, it was no precedent for the other states.
5. The School Segregation Cases: *Brown v. Board of Education* 347 U. S. 483 (1954); *Bolling v. Sharpe*, 347 U. S. 497 (1954).

6. The in which involved cation. F this meth the issue in 1948 Shelley v even if t need not raised.
7. *Sipuel* (1948).
7 and 8 down on
8. The a valid administri question private of the St McLauri U. S. 63 private sou, G Maryland Carolina the "Con cation" (1952).
9. Case cisions to state met with Board of Universi (1950); versity a Kissick North (1951); Civil Ac reported Universi Folio 10. 16

The PROBI educati tions o lic scho ant Ch of the al Assc

6. The Court may refuse to hear a case in which the basic constitutional question involved is not considered ripe for adjudication. For approximately twenty-five years this method was employed with respect to the issue of restrictive covenants. Then in 1948 it decided to meet the question. *Shelley v. Kraemer*, 334 U. S. 1. Of course even if the Court decides to hear a case, it need not resolve the constitutional question raised.

7. *Sipuel v. United States*, 332 U. S. 631 (1948). The case was argued on January 7 and 8, 1948, and decision was handed down on January 12th.

8. The decision which repudiates race as a valid criterion for public officials in the administration of public schools will unquestionably have as great an impact on private conduct. For example, as a result of the *Sweatt v. Painter*, 339 U. S. 629, and *McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents*, 339 U. S. 637, Negroes are now admitted to private universities and colleges in Missouri, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Texas, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, and the District of Columbia. See the "Courts and Racial Integration in Education" *Journal of Negro Education* 21: 3 (1952).

9. Cases brought subsequent to these decisions to secure the admission of Negroes to state graduate and professional schools met with uniform success. See *Wilson v. Board of Supervisors of Louisiana State University*, 92 F. Supp. 986 (E. D. La. 1950); *Gray v. Board of Trustees of University of Tennessee*, 342 U. S. 517; *McKissick v. Carmichael* (University of North Carolina) 187 F2d 949 (CA 4th 1951); *Swanson v. University of Virginia*, Civil Action No. 30 (W. D. Va. 1950) unreported; *Mitchell v. Board of Regents of University of Maryland*, Docket No. 16, Folio 126 (Baltimore City Court 1950).

10. 163 U. S. 537 (1896). This case in-

volved transportation, and not education as is popularly believed.

11. 305 U. S. 337 (1938). Lloyd Gaines, a Negro, applied for admission to the law school of the University of Missouri. There was no law school for Negroes in the state. He met all qualifications for admission except, of course, his color. He refused an out-of-state scholarship and brought suit to compel the school officials to admit him. The premise on which Gaines rested his case was that there was no state school in Missouri where he could obtain legal training equivalent to that available to white persons except at the University of Missouri; that the Fourteenth Amendment's requirement that equal protection be afforded Negroes could only be measured by what the state did within its own borders—hence an out-of-state scholarship plan for Negroes was no answer when their right to equal educational opportunities was asserted. One can see the legal approach here was totally consistent with the "separate but equal" as a valid constitutional doctrine. Gaines was merely saying the doctrine had not been observed by Missouri.

12. 339 U. S. 629 (1950). Here the problem was whether a segregated law school for Negroes was the equivalent of the University of Texas. The Court found the University of Texas superior, and ordered that Sweatt be admitted to its law school.

13. 339 U. S. 637 (1950). Here the problem was whether a Negro graduate student, admitted to the University of Oklahoma, but segregated in the classroom, cafeteria and library, was denied equal educational opportunities in the meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment. The Court found these restrictions denied McLaurin unequal education and ruled that he must be subjected only to same rules and regulations applicable to all other students.

CONCLUSIONS

KENNETH B. CLARK

City College of New York
and

Northside Center for Child Development

The articles in this issue of SOCIAL PROBLEMS explored some of the educational and sociological implications of the desegregation of the public schools. The role of the Protestant Church and the crucial future role of the social action agency, the National Association for the Advancement of

Colored People, which has been in the forefront of this specific social struggle were also described. Finally, a summary of the legal background and the implications of the May 17, 1954 decision for the elimination of other forms of racial discrimination and segregation were discussed.

Some of the important questions which were not thoroughly discussed in this issue of **SOCIAL PROBLEMS** but which must be answered in the future are:

1. What are some of the educational problems which must be solved in the transition from segregated to non-segregated public schools?
2. What, if any, role have national educational associations such as the NEA, the UPA and other groups of educators played in the solution of problems associated with desegregation of public schools?
3. What are some of the objective and subjective problems of class identification developed by whites within the social structure of racial segregation which might require modification in a racially desegregated society?
4. What similar problems and adjustments are posed for Negroes of different social and economic classes?
5. What are the fundamental changes in attitudes, behavior and self-concept of Negro and white children which can be expected as a consequence of experience in desegregated schools?
6. How will the personality pattern of whites and Negroes which were developed in a segregated setting influence their adjustment to a non-segregated setting?
7. What is the probable intensity and duration of this period of accommodation?
8. How has the issue of public school desegregation influenced the politics or political alignment in Southern, Border and Northern states?
9. What are the possible effects of this issue on national party politics in the 1956 elections?
10. What, if any, effect did the May 17th decision have on the attitudes of Europeans toward the United States?
11. Was there a difference in the reaction of the Western European nations and the reaction of the nations under Russian influence?
12. How did the people of Asia and Africa react?
13. What effect has the effective program of desegregation of Catholic Parochial schools in Border states and some Southern States had on general community acceptance of the possibility of public school desegregation?
14. Given the situation wherein the majority of whites in a given community object to desegregated public education and consider attempts to implement the May 17th decision to be a violation of their democratic rights, what are the ethical problems involved and how can they be resolved?

15. How does one resolve the dilemma of social morality which is inherent in the use of authority or governmental power to force local compliance with a decision which is believed by a majority of the nation to be a democratic and moral one?

16. Are these examples of the moral quagmire of the "end justifying the means?"

If not, why not?

One of the purposes of this issue was to determine what were the gaps in our knowledge and plans for the implementation of the desegregation decree. With this in mind Sol Markoff, Associate General Secretary of the National Child Labor Committee was asked to gather information necessary to answer the following questions:

1. What have national social welfare agencies contributed to community acceptance of desegregation of public schools?
2. What are their plans and programs for the future?
3. In what ways has the public discussion of public school desegregation influenced the racial policies of national welfare agencies?

The following excerpts from his reply illustrate the job which must be done in this and other areas of our society if we are to fulfill our responsibility for bringing about an orderly and effective change from a segregated to a non-segregated way of life:

In answering these questions, you suggested that I draw upon my experiences, my personal and professional observations, published works of scholars, and my own personal views. I accepted your invitation to contribute material on this subject with some misgivings for I had a strong feeling that there was not readily available the basic information necessary for a reply to your queries. Exploratory inquiries I made in the last few days have in no way altered my initial reaction. Rather, it has been fortified.

At present, the total picture is much too spotty to describe accurately. Efforts are being made by several groups, — the National Social Welfare Assembly among them,—to collect information which may perhaps help to answer, in part, or tangentially at least, some of the questions you posed. But, except for some fragmentary and inconclusive accounts about the policies and practices of a few national agencies, there is not too much that is known about what the social welfare field, as a whole, has

done, is now doing, or plans to do about desegregation.

I would not want you to think, however, that the lack of information at this time necessarily means lack of interest or activity by social welfare groups. There is much that suggests the contrary, on the part of some agencies, at least. But to define or evaluate such interest and action in terms which would be directly responsive to your queries, is somewhat difficult, for plans are more in the developmental stage, than in being, and their impact, if any, on the community, or even indeed, on their own internal operations, is not often easily measurable.

Numerically, there are some 70 large national social welfare agencies. But they are at different levels of development, offer different kinds of services and have different kinds of internal structures. I hesitate to say how many local affiliates these 70 national agencies have, but the number is undoubtedly well up in the thousands. Your questions were directed to the role of *national* organizations but learning about their policies and practices will yield only part of the story. We surely have to know what the parent bodies are doing, but just as important, we need to know about the policies and practices of their local affiliates. And the practices of the local affiliates, even within any one agency, may and undoubtedly do, vary considerably.

The scope of research, quantitatively, is one problem. There are others. The

services provided by national social welfare agencies and their local affiliates are diverse in function. A quick glance at the names of the groups affiliated with the National Social Welfare Assembly will give you an idea of the wide range of services and programs which come under the heading "Social Welfare". Because of this diversity, many of the agencies are affected by desegregation in different ways and to differing degrees. For some, the problem may touch them lightly, if at all. Others may necessarily be more deeply involved. A national agency like our own, for example, has quite different problems from one let us say, which is concerned with constructing or promoting recreational facilities in a community organized on a segregated basis or from a youth club which carries on its activities in a public school building. The contributions which agencies have made, or have failed to make in segregated areas, would have richer meaning only when judged against the background of the particular difficulties inherent in the type of service each provides.

All this adds up to a considerable amount of search and study. The fact that we do not now have the information you seek, only points up sharply the validity of your inquiry. We need to seek the answers to the questions you asked. But who is to do it? And when?

The answer to Markoff's questions is: "All of us and now."

TEXT OF THE SUPREME COURT OPINIONS MAY 17, 1954

Mr. Chief Justice Warren delivered the opinion of the Court.

These cases come to us from the States of Kansas, South Carolina, Virginia, and Delaware. They are premised on different facts and different local conditions, but a common legal question justifies their consideration together in this consolidated opinion.

In each of the cases, minors of the Negro race, through their legal representatives, seek the aid of the courts in obtaining admission to the public schools of their community on a non-segregated basis. In each instance, they had been denied admission to schools attended by white children under laws requiring or permitting segregation according to race. This segregation was alleged to deprive the plaintiffs of the equal protection of the laws under the Fourteenth Amendment. In each of the

cases other than the Delaware case, a three-judge federal district court denied relief to the plaintiffs on the so-called "separate but equal" doctrine announced by this Court in *Plessy v. Ferguson*, 163 U. S. 537. Under that doctrine, equality of treatment is accorded when the races are provided substantially equal facilities, even though these facilities be separate. In the Delaware case, the Supreme Court of Delaware adhered to that doctrine, but ordered that the plaintiffs be admitted to the white schools because of their superiority to the Negro schools.

The plaintiffs contend that segregated public schools are not "equal" and cannot be made "equal," and that hence they are deprived of the equal protection of the laws. Because of the obvious importance of the question presented, the Court took jurisdiction.² Argument was heard in the

1952 Term and reargument was heard this Term on certain questions propounded by the Court.³

Reargument was largely devoted to the circumstances surrounding the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment in 1868. It covered exhaustively consideration of the Amendment in Congress, ratification by the states, then existing practices in racial segregation, and the views of proponents and opponents of the Amendment. This discussion and our own investigation convince us that, although these sources cast some light, it is not enough to resolve the problem with which we are faced. At best, they are inconclusive. The most avid proponents of the post-War Amendments undoubtedly intended them to remove all legal distinctions among "all persons born or naturalized in the United States." Their opponents, just as certainly, were antagonistic to both the letter and the spirit of the Amendments and wished them to have the most limited effect. What others in Congress and the state legislatures had in mind cannot be determined with any degree of certainty.

An additional reason for the inconclusive nature of the Amendment's history, with respect to segregated schools, is the status of public education at that time.⁴ In the South, the movement toward free common schools, supported by general taxation, had not yet taken hold. Education of white children was largely in the hands of private groups. Education of Negroes was almost nonexistent, and practically all of the race were illiterate. In fact, any education of Negroes was forbidden by law in some states. Today, in contrast, many Negroes have achieved outstanding success in the arts and sciences as well as in the business and professional world. It is true that public education had already advanced further in the North, but the effect of the Amendment on Northern States was generally ignored in the congressional debates. Even in the North, the conditions of public education did not approximate those existing today. The curriculum was usually rudimentary; ungraded schools were common in rural areas; the school term was but three months a year in many states; and compulsory school attendance was virtually unknown. As a consequence, it is not surprising that there should be so little in the history of the Fourteenth Amendment relating to its intended effect on public education.

In the first cases in this Court construing the Fourteenth Amendment, decided shortly after its adoption, the Court interpreted it as proscribing all state-imposed discriminations against the Negro race.⁵ The doctrine of "separate but equal" did not make its appearance in this Court until 1896 in the case of *Plessy v. Ferguson* *supra*, involving not education but transportation.⁶

American courts have since labored with the doctrine for half a century. In this Court there have been six cases involving the "separate but equal" doctrine in the field of public education.⁷ In *Cumming v. County Board of Education*, 175 U. S. 528, and *Gong Lum v. Rice*, 275 U. S. 78, the validity of the doctrine itself was not challenged.⁸ In more recent cases, all on the graduate school level, inequality was found in that specific benefits enjoyed by white students were denied to Negro students of the same educational qualifications. *Missouri ex rel. Gaines v. Canada*, 305 U. S. 337; *Sipuel v. Oklahoma*, 332 U. S. 631; *Sweatt v. Painter*, 339 U. S. 629; *McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents*, 339 U. S. 637. In none of these cases was it necessary to re-examine the doctrine to grant relief to the Negro plaintiff. And in *Sweatt v. Painter*, *supra*, the Court expressly reserved decision on the question whether *Plessy v. Ferguson* should be held inapplicable to public education.

In the instant cases, that question is directly presented. Here, unlike *Sweatt v. Painter*, there are findings below that the Negro and white schools involved have been equalized, or are being equalized with respect to buildings, curricula, qualifications and salaries of teachers, and other "tangible" factors.⁹ Our decision, therefore cannot turn on merely a comparison of these tangible factors in the Negro and white schools involved in each of the cases. We must look instead to the effect of segregation itself on public education.

In approaching this problem, we cannot turn the clock back to 1868 when the Amendment was adopted, or even to 1896 when *Plessy v. Ferguson* was written. We must consider public education in the light of its full development and its present place in American life throughout the Nation. Only in this way can it be determined if segregation in public schools deprives these plaintiffs of the equal protection of the laws.

Today, education is perhaps the most important function of state and local governments. Compulsory school attendance laws and the great expenditures for education both demonstrate our recognition of the importance of education to our democratic society. It is required in the performance of our most basic public responsibilities, even service in the armed forces. It is the very foundation of good citizenship. Today it is a principal instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment. In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to

provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.

We come then to the question presented: Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other "tangible" factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities? We believe that it does.

In *Sweatt v. Painter*, *supra*, in finding that a segregated law school for Negroes could not provide them equal educational opportunities, this Court relied in large part on "those qualities which are incapable of objective measurement but which make for greatness in a law school." In *McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents*, *supra*, the Court, in requiring that a Negro admitted to a white graduate school be treated like all other students, again resorted to intangible considerations: "... his ability to study, to engage in discussions and exchange views with other students, and, in general, to learn his profession." Such considerations apply with added force to children in grade and high schools. To separate them from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may effect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone. The effect of this separation on their educational opportunities was well stated by a finding in the Kansas case by a court which nevertheless felt compelled to rule against the Negro plaintiffs:

"Segregation of white and colored children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of the law; for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the Negro group. A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to retard the educational and mental development of Negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racially integrated school system."¹⁰

Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, this finding is amply supported by modern authority.¹¹ Any language in *Plessy v. Ferguson* contrary to this finding is rejected.

We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Therefore, we hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated for whom the actions have been brought are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the

Fourteenth Amendment. This disposition makes unnecessary any discussion whether such segregation also violates the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.¹²

Because these are class actions, because of the wide applicability of this decision, and because of the great variety of local conditions, the formulation of decrees in these cases presents problems of considerable complexity. On reargument, the consideration of appropriate relief was necessarily subordinated to the primary question — the constitutionality of segregation in public education. We have now announced that such segregation is a denial of the equal protection of the laws. In order that we may have the full assistance of the parties in formulating decrees, the cases will be restored to the docket, and the parties are requested to present further argument on Questions 4 and 5 previously propounded by the Court for the reargument this Term.¹³ The Attorney General of the United States is again invited to participate. The Attorneys General of the states requiring or permitting segregation in public education will also be permitted to appear as *amici curiae* upon request to do so by September 15, 1954, and submission of briefs by October 1, 1954.¹⁴

It is so ordered.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DECISION

Mr. Chief Justice Warren delivered the opinion of the Court.

This case (*Bolling v. Sharpe*) challenges the validity of segregation in the public schools of the District of Columbia. The petitioners, minors of the Negro race, allege that such segregation deprives them of due process of law under the Fifth Amendment. They were refused admission to a public school attended by white children solely because of their race. They sought the aid of the District Court for the District of Columbia in obtaining admission. That court dismissed their complaint. We granted a writ of certiorari before judgment in the Court of Appeals because of the importance of the constitutional question presented. 344 U. S. 873.

We have this day held that the Equal Protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment prohibits the states from maintaining racially segregated public schools.¹⁵ The legal problem in the District of Columbia is somewhat different, however. The Fifth Amendment, which is applicable in the District of Columbia, does not contain an equal protection clause as does the Fourteenth Amendment which applies only to the states. But the concepts of equal protection and due process, both stemming from our American ideal of fairness, are not mutually exclusive. The "equal protection of the laws" is a more explicit safeguard of prohibited unfairness than "due process of law," and, therefore, we do not

imply that the two are always interchangeable phrases. But, as this Court has recognized, discrimination may be so unjustifiable as to be violative of due process.¹⁶

Classifications based solely upon race must be scrutinized with particular care since they are contrary to our traditions and hence constitutionally suspect.¹⁷ As long ago as 1896, this Court declared the principle "that the Constitution of the United States, in its present form, forbids, so far as civil and political rights are concerned, discrimination by the General Government, or by the States, against any citizen because of his race."¹⁸ And in *Buchanan v. Warley*, 245 U. S. 60, the Court held that a statute which limited the right of a property owner to convey his property to a person of another race was, as an unreasonable discrimination, a denial of due process of law.

Although the Court has not assumed to define "liberty" with any great precision, that term is not confined to mere freedom from bodily restraint. Liberty under law extends to the full range of conduct which the individual is free to pursue, and it cannot be restricted except for a proper governmental objective. Segregation in public education is not reasonably related to any proper governmental objective, and thus imposes on Negro children of the District of Columbia a burden that constitutes an arbitrary deprivation on their liberty in violation of the Due Process Clause.

In view of our decision that the Constitution prohibits the states from maintaining racially segregated public schools, it would be unthinkable that the same Constitution would impose a lesser duty on the Federal Government.¹⁹ We hold that racial segregation in the public schools of the District of Columbia is a denial of the due process of law guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution.

For the reasons set out in *Brown v. Board of Education*, this case will be restored to the docket for reargument on Questions 4 and 5 previously propounded by the Court. 345 U. S. 972.

It is so ordered.

THE SUPREME COURT'S FOOTNOTES

¹ In the Kansas case, *Brown v. Board of Education*, the plaintiffs are Negro children of elementary school age residing in Topeka. They brought this action in the United States District Court for the District of Kansas to enjoin enforcement of a Kansas statute which permits, but does not require, cities of more than 15,000 population to maintain separate school facilities for Negro and white students. Kan. Gen. Stat. (Sec.) 72-1724 (1949). Pursuant to that authority, the Topeka Board of Education elected to establish segregated elementary schools. Other public schools in the community, however, are operated on a non-segregated basis. The three-judge Dis-

trict Court, convened under 28 U. S. C. (Secs.) 2281 and 2284, found that segregation in public education has a detrimental effect upon Negro children, but denied relief on the ground that the Negro and white schools were substantially equal with respect to buildings, transportation, curricula, and educational qualifications of teachers. 98 F. Supp. 797. The case is here on direct appeal upon 28 U. S. C. (Sec.) 1253.

In the South Carolina case, *Briggs v. Elliott*, the plaintiffs are Negro children of both elementary and high school age residing in Clarendon County. They brought this action in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to enjoin enforcement of provisions in the state constitution and statutory code which require the segregation of Negroes and whites in public schools. S. C. Const., Art. XI, (Sec.) 7; S. C. Code (Sec.) 5377 (1942). The three-judge District Court, convened under 28 U. S. C. (Secs.) 2281 and 2284, denied the requested relief. The court found that the Negro schools were inferior to the white schools and ordered the defendants to begin immediately to equalize the facilities. But the court sustained the validity of the contested provisions and denied the plaintiffs admission to the white schools during the equalization program. 98 F. Supp. 529. This Court vacated the District Court's judgment and remanded the case for the purpose of obtaining the court's views on a report filed by the defendant's concerning the progress made in the equalization program. 342 U. S. 350. On remand, the District Court found that substantial equality had been achieved except for buildings and that the defendants were proceeding to rectify this inequality as well. 103 F. Supp. 920. The case is again here on direct appeal under 28 U. S. C. (Sec.) 1253.

In the Virginia case, *Davis v. County School Board*, the plaintiffs are Negro children of high school age residing in Prince Edward County. They brought this action in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to enjoin enforcement of provisions in the state constitution and statutory code which require the segregation of Negroes and whites in public schools. Va. Const., (Sec.) 140; Va. Code (Sec.) 22-221 (1950). The three-judge District Court, convened under 28 U. S. C. (Secs.) 2281 and 2284, denied the requested relief. The court found the Negro school inferior in physical plant, curricula, and transportation, and ordered the defendants forthwith to provide substantially equal curricula and transportation and to "proceed with all reasonable diligence and dispatch to remove" the inequality in physical plant. But, as in the South Carolina case, the court sustained the validity of the contested provisions and denied the plaintiffs admission to the white schools during the equalization program.

103 F. Supp. 337. The case is here on direct appeal under 28 U. S. C. (Sec.) 1253.

In the Delaware case, *Gebhart v. Belton*, the plaintiffs are Negro children of both elementary and high school age residing in New Castle County. They brought this action in the Delaware Court of Chancery to enjoin enforcement of provisions in the state constitution and statutory code which require the segregation of Negroes and whites in public schools. Del. Const., Art. X, (Sec.) 2; Del. Rev. Code (Sec.) 2631 (1935). The Chancellor gave judgment for the plaintiffs and ordered their immediate admission to schools previously attended only by white children, on the ground that the Negro schools were inferior with respect to teacher training, pupil-teacher ratio, extra-curricular activities, physical plant, and time and distance involved in travel. 87 A. 2d 862. The Chancellor also found that segregation itself results in an inferior education for Negro children (see note 10, *infra*), but did not rest his decision on that ground. *Id.*, at 865. The Chancellor's decree was affirmed by the Supreme Court of Delaware, which intimated, however, that the defendants might be able to obtain a modification of the decree after equalization of the Negro and white schools had been accomplished. 91 A. 2d 137, 152. The defendants, contending only that the Delaware courts had erred in ordering the immediate admission of the Negro plaintiffs to the white schools, applied to this Court for certiorari. The writ was granted, 344 U. S. 891. The plaintiffs, who were successful below, did not submit a cross-petition.

² 344 U. S. 1, 141², 891.

³ 345 U. S. 972. The Attorney General of the United States participated both Terms as *amicus curiae*.

⁴ For a general study of the development of public education prior to the Amendment, see Butts and Cremin, *A History of Education in American Culture* (1953), Pts. I, II; Cubberley, *Public Education in the United States* (1934 ed.), cc. II-XII. School practices current at the time of the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment are described in Butts and Cremin, *supra*, at 269-275; Cubberley, *supra*, at 288-339, 408-431; Knight, *Public Education in the South* (1922), cc. VIII, IX. See also H. Ex. Doc. No. 315, 41st Cong., 2d Sess. (1871). Although the demand for free public schools followed substantially the same pattern in both the North and the South, the development in the South did not begin to gain momentum until about 1850, some twenty years after that in the North. The reasons for the somewhat slower development in the South (*e.g.*, the rural character of the South and the different regional attitudes toward state assistance) are well explained in Cubberley, *supra*, at 408, 423. In the coun-

try as a whole, but particularly in the South, the War virtually stopped all progress in public education. *Id.*, at 427-428. The low status of Negro education in all sections of the country, both before and immediately after the War, is described in Beale, *A History of Freedom of Teaching in American Schools* (1941), 112-132, 175-195. Compulsory school attendance laws were not generally adopted until after the ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment, and it was not until 1918 that such laws were in force in all the states. Cubberley, *supra*, at 563-565.

⁵ *Slaughter-House Cases*, 16 Wall. 36, 67-72 (1873); *Strauder v. West Virginia*, 100 U. S. 303, 307-308 (1879): "It ordains that no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, or deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. What is this but declaring that the law in the States shall be the same for the black as for the white; that all persons, whether colored or white, shall stand equal before the laws of the States, and in regard to the colored race, for whose protection the amendment was primarily designed, that no discrimination shall be made against them by law because of their color? The words of the amendment, it is true, are prohibitory, but they contain a necessary implication of a positive immunity, or right, most valuable to the colored race, — the right to exemption from unfriendly legislation against them distinctively as colored, — exemption from legal discriminations, implying inferiority in civil society, lessening the security of their enjoyment of the rights which others enjoy, and discriminations which are steps towards reducing them to the condition of a subject race."

See also *Virginia v. Rives*, 100 U. S. 313, 318 (1879); *Ex parte Virginia*, (100) U. S. 339, 344-345 (1879).

⁶ The doctrine apparently originated in *Roberts v. City of Boston*, 59 Mass. 198, 206 (1849), upholding school segregation against attack as being violative of a state constitutional guarantee of equality. Segregation in Boston public schools was eliminated in 1855. Mass Acts 1855, c. 256. But elsewhere in the North segregation in public education has persisted until recent years. It is apparent that such segregation has long been a nationwide problem, not merely one of sectional concern.

⁷ See also *Berea College v. Kentucky*, 211 U. S. 45 (1908).

⁸ In the *Cumming* case, Negro taxpayers sought an injunction requiring the defendant school board to discontinue the operation of a high school for white children until the board resumed operation of a high school for Negro children. Similarly, in the *Gong Lum* case, the plaintiff, a child of Chinese descent, contended only that state authorities had misapplied the doc-

trine by classifying him with Negro children and requiring him to attend a Negro school.

⁹ In the Kansas case, the court below found substantial equality as to all such factors. 98 F. Supp. 797, 798. In the South Carolina case, the court below found that the defendants were proceeding "promptly and in good faith to comply with the court's decree." 103 F. Supp. 920, 921. In the Virginia case, the court below noted that the equalization program was already "afoot and progressing" (103 F. Supp. 337, 341); since then, we have been advised, in the Virginia Attorney General's brief on reargument, that the program has now been completed. In the Delaware case, the court below similarly noted that the state's equalization program was well under way. 91 A. 2d 137, 149.

¹⁰ A similar finding was made in the Delaware case: "I conclude from the testimony that in our Delaware society, State-imposed segregation in education itself results in the Negro children, as a class, receiving educational opportunities which are substantially inferior to those available to white children otherwise similarly situated." 87 A. 2d 862, 865.

¹¹ K. B. Clark, *Effect of Prejudice and Discrimination on Personality Development* (Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth, 1950); Witmer and Kotinsky, *Personality in the Making* (1952), c. VI; Deutscher and Chein, *The Psychological Effects of Enforced Segregation: A Survey of Social Science Opinion*, 26 J. Psychol. 259 (1948); Chein, *What Are the Psychological Effects of Segregation Under Conditions of Equal Facilities?*, 3 Int. J. Opinion and Attitude Res. 229 (1949); Brameld, *Educational Costs, in Discrimination and National Welfare* (McIver ed., 1949), 44-48; Frazier, *The Negro in the United States* (1949), 674-681. And see generally Myrdal, *An American Dilemma* (1944).

¹² See *Bolling v. Sharpe*, *infra*, concerning

the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

¹³ "4. Assuming it is decided that segregation in public schools violates the Fourteenth Amendment

"(a) would a decree necessarily follow providing that, within the limits set by normal geographic school districting, Negro children should forthwith be admitted to schools of their choice, or

"(b) may this Court, in the exercise of its equity powers, permit an effective gradual adjustment to be brought about from existing segregated systems to a system not based on color distinctions?"

"5. On the assumption on which questions 4 (a) and (b) are based, and assuming further that this Court will exercise its equity powers to the end described in question 4 (b),

"(a) should this Court formulate detailed decrees in these cases;

"(b) if so, what specific issues should the decrees reach;

"(c) should this Court appoint a special master to hear evidence with a view to recommending specific terms for such decrees;

"(d) should this Court remand to the courts of first instance with directions to frame decrees in these cases, and if so, what general directions should the decrees of this Court include and what procedures should the courts of first instance follow in arriving at the specific terms of more detailed decrees?"

¹⁴ See Rule 42, Revised Rules of this Court (effective July 1, 1954).

¹⁵ *Brown v. Board of Education*, — U. S. —.

¹⁶ *Detroit Bank v. United States*, 317 U. S. 329; *Currin v. Wallace*, 306 U. S. 1, 13-14, *Steward Machine Co. v. Davis*, 301 U. S. 548, 585.

¹⁷ *Korematsu v. United States*, 323 U. S. 214, 216; *Hirabayashi v. United States*, 320 U. S. 81, 100.

¹⁸ *Gibson v. Mississippi*, 162 U. S. 565, 591. Cf. *Steele v. Louisville & Nashville R. Co.*, 323 U. S. 192, 198-199.

¹⁹ Cf. *Hurd v. Hodge*, 334 U. S. 24.

APPENDIX TO APPELLANTS' BRIEFS: STATEMENTS BY SOCIAL SCIENTISTS

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
October Term, 1952

No. 8

OLIVER BROWN, MRS. RICHARD LAWTON, MRS. SADIE EMMANUEL, *et al.*,
Appellants,
BOARD OF EDUCATION OF TOPEKA, SHAWNEE COUNTY, KANSAS, *et al.*

No. 101

Appellants,

vs.

R. W. ELLIOT, Chairman, J. D. CARSON, *et al.*, Members of the Board of Trustees of
School District No. 22, Clarendon County, S. C., *et al.*

No. 191

DOROTHY E. DAVIS, BERTHA M. DAVIS and INEZ D. DAVIS, *etc.*, *et al.*,
Appellants,

vs.

COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD OF PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY, VIRGINIA, *et al.*

APPENDIX TO APPELLANT'S BRIEFS

The Effects of Segregation and the Consequences of Desegregation: A Social Science Statement

I

The problem of the segregation of racial and ethnic groups constitutes one of the major problems facing the American people today. It seems desirable, therefore, to summarize the contributions which contemporary social science can make toward its resolution. There are, of course, moral and legal issues involved with respect to which the signers of the present statement cannot speak with any special authority and which must be taken into account in the solution of the problem. There are, however, also factual issues involved with respect to which certain conclusions seem to be justified on the basis of the available scientific evidence. It is with these issues only that this paper is concerned. Some of the issues have to do with the consequences of segregation, some with the problems of changing from segregated to unsegregated practices. These two groups of issues will be dealt with in separate sections below. It is necessary, first, however, to define and delimit the problem to be discussed.

DEFINITIONS

For purposes of the present statement, *segregation* refers to that restriction of opportunities for different types of associations between the members of one racial, religious, national or geographic origin, or linguistic group and those of other groups, which results from or is supported by the action of any official body or agency representing some branch of government. We are not here concerned with such segrega-

tion as arises from the free movements of individuals which are neither enforced nor supported by official bodies, nor with the segregation of criminals or of individuals with communicable diseases which aims at protecting society from those who might harm it.

Where the action takes place in a social milieu in which the groups involved do not enjoy equal social status, the group that is of lesser social status will be referred to as the *segregated* group.

In dealing with the question of the effects of segregation, it must be recognized that these effects do not take place in a vacuum, but in a social context. The segregation of Negroes and of other groups in the United States takes place in a social milieu in which "race" prejudice and discrimination exist. It is questionable in the view of some students of the problem whether it is possible to have segregation without substantial discrimination. Myrdal¹ states: "Segregation * * * is financially possible and, indeed, a device of economy only as it is combined with substantial discrimination" (p. 629). The imbeddedness of segregation in such a context makes it difficult to disentangle the effects of segregation *per se* from the effects of the context. Similarly, it is difficult to disentangle the effects of segregation from the effects of a pattern of social disorganization commonly associated with it and reflected in high

¹ Myrdal, G., *An American Dilemma*, 1944.

disease and mortality rates, crime and delinquency, poor housing, disrupted family life and general substandard living conditions. We shall, however, return to this problem after consideration of the observable effects of the total complex in which segregation is a major component.

II

At the recent Mid-century White House Conference on Children and Youth, a fact-finding report on the effects of prejudice, discrimination and segregation on the personality development of children was prepared as a basis for some of the deliberations.² This report brought together the available social science and psychological studies which were related to the problem of how racial and religious prejudices influenced the development of a healthy personality. It highlighted the fact that segregation, prejudices and discriminations, and their social concomitants potentially damage the personality of all children—the children of the majority group in a somewhat different way than the more obviously damaged children of the minority group.

The report indicates that as minority group children learn the inferior status to which they are assigned—as they observe the fact that they are almost always segregated and kept apart from others who are treated with more respect by the society as a whole—they often react with feelings of inferiority and a sense of personal humiliation. Many of them become confused about their own personal worth. On the one hand, like all other human beings they require a sense of personal dignity; on the other hand, almost nowhere in the larger society do they find their own dignity as human beings respected by others. Under these conditions, the minority group child is thrown into a conflict with regard to his feelings about himself and his group. He wonders whether his group and he himself are worthy of no more respect than they receive. This conflict and confusion leads to self-hatred and rejection of his own group.

The report goes on to point out that these children must find ways with which to cope with this conflict. Not every child, of course, reacts with the same patterns of behavior. The particular pattern depends upon many interrelated factors, among which are: the stability and quality of his family relations; the social and economic class to which he belongs; the cultural and educational background of his

parents; the particular minority group to which he belongs; his personal characteristics, intelligence, special talents, and personality pattern.

Some children, usually of the lower socio-economic classes, may react by overt aggressions and hostility directed toward their own group or members of the dominant group.³ Anti-social and delinquent behavior may often be interpreted as reactions to these racial frustrations. These reactions are self-destructive in that the larger society not only punishes those who commit them, but often interprets such aggressive and anti-social behavior as justification for continuing prejudice and segregation.

Middle class and upper class minority group children are likely to react to their racial frustrations and conflicts by withdrawal and submissive behavior. Or, they may react with compensatory and rigid conformity to the prevailing middle class values and standards and an aggressive determination to succeed in these terms in spite of the handicap of their minority status.

The report indicates that minority group children of all social and economic classes often react with a generally defeatist attitude and a lowering of personal ambitions. This, for example, is reflected in a lowering of pupil morale and a depression of the educational aspiration level among minority group children in segregated schools. In producing such effects, segregated schools impair the ability of the child to profit from the educational opportunities provided him.

Many minority group children of all classes also tend to be hypersensitive and anxious about their relations with the larger society. They tend to see hostility and rejection even in those areas where these might not actually exist.

The report concludes that while the range of individual differences among members of a rejected minority group is as wide as among other peoples, the evidence suggests that all of these children are unnecessarily encumbered in some ways by segregation and its concomitants.

With reference to the impact of segregation and its concomitants on children of

² Clark, K. B., *Effect of Prejudice and Discrimination on Personality Development*, Fact Finding Report Mid-century White House Conference on Children and Youth, Children's Bureau, Federal Security Agency, 1950 (mimeographed).

³ Brenman, M., *The Relationship Between Minority Group Identification in A Group of Urban Middle Class Negro Girls*, *J. Soc. Psychol.*, 1940, 11, 171-197; Brenman, M. *Minority Group Membership and Religious, Psychosexual and Social Patterns in A Group of Middle-Class Negro Girls*, *J. Soc. Psychol.*, 1940, 12, 179-196; Brenman, M., *Urban Lower-Class Negro Girls*, *Psychiatry*, 1953, 6, 307-324; Davis, A., *The Socialization of the American Negro Child and Adolescent*, *J. Negro Educ.*, 1939, 8, 264-275.

the majority group, the report indicates that the effects are somewhat more obscure. Those children who learn the prejudices of our society are also being taught to gain personal status in an unrealistic and non-adaptive way. When comparing themselves to members of the minority group, they are not required to evaluate themselves in terms of the more basic standards of actual personal ability and achievement. The culture permits and at times, encourages them to direct their feelings of hostility and aggression against whole groups of people the members of which are perceived as weaker than themselves. They often develop patterns of guilt feelings, rationalizations and other mechanisms which they must use in an attempt to protect themselves from recognizing the essential injustice of their unrealistic fears and hatreds of minority groups.⁴

The report indicates further that confusion, conflict, moral cynicism, and disrespect for authority may arise in majority group children as a consequence of being taught the moral, religious and democratic principles of the brotherhood of man and the importance of justice and fair play by the same persons and institutions who, in their support of racial segregation and related practices, seem to be acting in a prejudiced and discriminatory manner. Some individuals may attempt to resolve this conflict by intensifying their hostility toward the minority group. Others may react by guilt feelings which are not necessarily reflected in more humane attitudes toward the minority group. Still others react by developing an unwholesome, rigid, and uncritical idealization of all authority figures—their parents' strong political and economic leaders. As described in *The Authoritarian Personality*,⁵ they despise the weak, while they obsequiously and unquestioningly conform to the demands of the strong whom they also, paradoxically, subconsciously hate.

With respect to the setting in which these difficulties develop, the report emphasized the role of the home, the school, and other social institutions. Studies⁶ have shown that from the earliest school years children are not only aware of the status differences among different groups in the society but begin to react with the patterns described above.

Conclusions similar to those reached by the Mid-century White House Conference Report have been stated by other social scientists who have concerned themselves with this problem. The following are some examples of these conclusions:

⁴ Adorno, T. W.; Frenkel-Brunswick, E.; Levinson, D. J.; Sanford, R. N., *The Authoritarian Personality*, 1951.

⁵ Adorno, T. W.; Frenkel Brunswick, E.; Levinson, D. J.; Sanford, R. N., *The Authoritarian Personality*, 1951.

Segregation imposes upon individuals a distorted sense of social reality.⁷

Segregation leads to a blockage in the communications and interaction between the two groups. Such blockages tend to increase mutual suspicion, distrust and hostility.⁸

Segregation not only perpetuates rigid stereotypes and reinforces negative attitudes toward members of the other group, but also leads to the development of a social climate within which violent outbreaks of racial tensions are likely to occur.⁹

We return now to the question, deferred earlier, of what it is about the total society complex of which segregation is one feature that produces the effects described above—or, more precisely, to the question of whether we can justifiably conclude that, as only one feature of a complex social setting, segregation is in fact a significantly contributing factor to these effects.

To answer this question, it is necessary to bring to bear the general fund of psychological and sociological knowledge concerning the role of various environmental influences in producing feelings of inferiority, confusions in personal roles, various types of basic personality structures and the various forms of personal and social disorganization.

On the basis of this general fund of knowledge, it seems likely that feelings of inferiority and doubts about personal worth are attributable to living in an underprivileged environment only insofar as the latter is itself perceived as an indicator of low social status and as a symbol of inferiority. In other words, one of the important determinants in producing such feelings is the awareness of social status difference. While there are many other factors that serve as reminders of the differences in social sta-

⁶ Clark, K. B. & Clark, M. P., Emotional Factors in Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children, *J. Negro Educ.*, 1950, 19, 341-350; Clark, K. B. & Clark M. P., Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children, *Readings in Social Psychology*, Ed. by Newcomb & Hartley, 1947; Radke, M.; Trager, H.; Davis H., Social Perceptions and Attitudes of Children, *Genetic Psychol. Monog.*, 1949, 40, 327-447; Radke, M.; Trager, H.; Children's Perceptions of the Social Role of Negroes and Whites, *J. Psychol.*, 1950, 29, 3-33.

⁷ Reid, Ira, What Segregated Areas Mean; Brameld, T., Educational Cost, *Discrimination and National Welfare*, Ed. by MacIver, R. M., 1949.

⁸ Frazier, E., *The Negro in the United States*, 1949; Krech, D. & Crutchfield, R. S., *Theory and Problems of Social Psychology*, 1948; Newcomb, T., *Social Psychology*, 1950.

⁹ Lee, A. McClung and Humphrey, N. D., *Race Riot*, 1943.

tus, there can be little doubt that the fact of enforced segregation is a major factor.¹⁰

This seems to be true for the following reasons among others: (1) because enforced segregation results from the decision of the majority group without the consent of the segregated and is commonly so perceived; and (2) because historically segregation patterns in the United States were developed on the assumption of the inferiority of the segregated.

In addition, enforced segregation gives official recognition and sanction to these other factors of the social complex, and thereby enhances the affects of the latter in creating the awareness of social status differences and feelings of inferiority.¹¹ The child who, for example, is compelled to attend a segregated school may be able to cope with ordinary expressions of prejudice by regarding the prejudiced person as evil or misguided; but he cannot readily cope with symbols of authority, the full force of the authority of the State—the school or the school board, in this instance—in the same manner. Given both the ordinary expression of prejudice and the school's policy of segregation, the former takes on greater force and seemingly becomes an official expression of the latter.

Not all of the psychological traits which are commonly observed in the social complex under discussion can be related so directly to the awareness of status differences—which in turn is, as we have already noted, materially contributed to by the practices of segregation. Thus, the low level of aspiration and defeatism so commonly observed in segregated groups is undoubtedly related to the level of self-evaluation; but it is also, in some measure, related among other things to one's expectations with regard to opportunities for achievement and, having achieved, to the opportunities for making use of these achievements. Similarly, the hypersensitivity and anxiety displayed by many minority group children about their relations with the larger society probably reflects their awareness of status differences; but it may also be influenced by the relative absence of opportunities for equal status contact which would provide correctives for prevailing unrealistic stereotypes.

The preceding view is consistent with the opinion stated by a large majority (90%) of social scientists who replied to a questionnaire concerning the probable effects of enforced segregation under conditions of equal facilities. This opinion was that, regardless of the facilities which are provided, enforced segregation is psycholog-

ically detrimental to the members of the segregated group.¹²

Similar considerations apply to the question of what features of the social complex of which segregation is a part contribute to the development of the traits which have been observed in majority group members. Some of these are probably quite closely related to the awareness of status differences, to which, as has already been pointed out, segregation makes a material contribution. Others have a more complicated relationship to the total social setting. Thus, the acquisition of an unrealistic basis for self-evaluation as a consequence of majority group membership probably reflects fairly closely the awareness of status differences. On the other hand, unrealistic fears and hatreds of minority groups, as in the case of the converse phenomenon among minority group members, are probably significantly influenced as well by the lack of opportunities for equal status contact.

With reference to the probable effects of segregation under conditions of equal facilities on majority group members, many of the social scientists who responded to the poll in the survey cited above felt that the evidence is less convincing than with regard to the probable effects of such segregation on minority group members, and the effects are possibly less widespread. Nonetheless, more than 80% stated it as their opinion that the effects of such segregation are psychologically detrimental to the majority group members.¹³

It may be noted that many of these social scientists supported their opinions on the effects of segregation on both majority and minority groups by reference to one or another or to several of the following four lines of published and unpublished evidence.¹⁴ First, studies of children throw light on the relative priority of the awareness of status differentials and related factors as compared to the awareness of differences in facilities. On this basis, it is possible to infer some of the consequences of segregation as distinct from the influence of inequalities of facilities. Second, clinical studies and depth interviews throw light on the genetic sources and causal sequences of various patterns of psychological reac-

¹¹ Reid, Ira, *What Segregated Areas Mean, Discrimination and National Welfare*, Ed. by MacIver, R. M., 1949.

¹² Deutscher, M. and Chein, I., *The Psychological Effects of Enforced Segregation: A Survey of Social Science Opinion*, *J. Psychol.*, 1948, 26, 259-287.

¹³ Deutscher, M. and Chein, I., *The Psychological Effects of Enforced Segregation: A Survey of Social Science Opinion*, *J. Psychol.*, 1948, 26, 259-287.

¹⁴ Chein, I., *What Are the Psychological Effects of Segregation Under Conditions of Equal Facilities?*, *International J. Opinion and Attitude Res.*, 1949, 2, 229-234.

¹⁰ Frazier, E., *The Negro in the United States*, 1949; Myrdal, G., *An American Dilemma*, 1944.

tion; and, again, certain inferences are possible with respect to the effects of segregation *per se*. Third, there actually are some relevant but relatively rare instances of segregation with equal or even superior facilities, as in the cases of certain Indian reservations. Fourth, since there are inequalities of facilities in racially and ethnically homogeneous groups, it is possible to infer the kinds of effects attributable to such inequalities in the absence of effects of segregation and by a kind of subtraction to estimate the effects of segregation *per se* in situations where one finds both segregation and unequal facilities.

III

Segregation is at present a social reality. Questions may be raised, therefore, as to what are the likely consequences of desegregation.

One such question asks whether the inclusion of an intellectually inferior group may jeopardize the education of the more intelligent group by lowering educational standards or damage the less intelligent group by placing it in a situation where it is at a marked competitive disadvantage. Behind this question is the assumption, which is examined below, that the presently segregated groups actually are inferior intellectually.

The available scientific evidence indicates that much, perhaps all, of the observable differences among various racial and national groups may be adequately explained in terms of environmental differences.¹⁵ It has been found, for instance, that the differences between the average intelligence test scores of Negro and white children decrease, and the overlap of the distributions increases, proportionately to the number of years that the Negro children have lived in the North.¹⁶ Related studies have shown that this change cannot be explained by the hypothesis of selective migration.¹⁷ It seems clear, therefore, that fears based on the assumption of innate racial differences in intelligence are not well founded.

It may also be noted in passing that the argument regarding the intellectual inferiority of one group as compared to another is, as applied to schools, essentially an argument for homogeneous groupings of children by intelligence rather than by race. Since even those who believe that there are innate differences between Negroes and whites in America in average intelligence grant that considerable overlap between the two groups exists, it would follow that it may be expedient to group together the superior whites and Negroes, the aver-

age whites and Negroes, and so on. Actually, many educators have come to doubt the wisdom of class groupings made homogeneous solely on the basis of intelligence.¹⁸ Those who are opposed to such homogeneous grouping believe that this type of segregation, too, appears to create generalized feelings of inferiority in the child who attends a below average class leads to undesirable emotional consequences in the education of the gifted child, and reduces learning opportunities which result from the interaction of individuals with varied gifts.

A second problem that comes up in an evaluation of the possible consequences of desegregation involves the question of whether segregation prevents or stimulates inter-racial tension and conflict and the corollary question of whether desegregation has one or the other effect.

The most direct evidence available on this problem comes from observations and systematic study of instances in which desegregation has occurred. Comprehensive reviews of such instances¹⁹ clearly establish the fact that desegregation has been carried out successfully in a variety of situations although outbreaks of violence had been commonly predicted. Extensive desegregation has taken place without major incidents in the armed services in both Northern and Southern installations and involving officers and enlisted men from all parts of the country, including the South.²⁰

¹⁸ Brooks, J. J., *Interage Grouping on Trial-Continuous Learning*, *Bulletin No. 87, Association for Childhood Education*, 1951; Lane, R. H., *Teacher in Modern Elementary School*, 1941; Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administration Report in *Education For All Americans*, published by the N. E. A. 1948.

¹⁹ Delano, W., *Grade School Segregation: The Latest Attack on Racial Discrimination*, *Yale Law Journal*, 1952, 61, 5, 730-744; Rose, A., *The Influence of Legislation on Prejudice*; Chapter 53 in *Race Prejudice and Discrimination*, Ed. by Rose, A., 1951; Rose, A., *Studies in Reduction of Prejudice*, Amer. Council on Race Relations, 1948.

²⁰ Kenworthy, E. W., *The Case Against Army Segregation*, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 1951, 275, 27-33; Nelson, Lt. D. D., *The Integration of the Negro in the U. S. Navy*, 1951; *Opinions About Negro Infantry Platoons in White Companies in Several Divisions*, *Information and Education Division*, U. S. War Department, Report No. B-157, 1945.

¹⁵ Klineberg, O., *Characteristics of American Negro*, 1945; Klineberg, O., *Race Differences*, 1936.

¹⁶ Klineberg, O., *Negro Intelligence and Selective Migration*, 1935.

¹⁷ Klineberg, O., *Negro Intelligence and Selective Migration*, 1935.

Similar changes have been noted in housing²¹ and industry.²² During the last war, many factories both in the North and South hired Negroes on a non-segregated, non-discriminatory basis. While a few strikes occurred, refusal by management and unions to yield quelled all strikes within a few days.²³

Relevant to this general problem is a comprehensive study of urban race riots which found that race riots occurred in segregated neighborhoods, whereas there was no violence in sections of the city where the two races lived, worked and attended school together.²⁴

Under certain circumstances desegregation not only proceeds without major difficulties, but has been observed to lead to the emergence of more favorable attitudes and friendlier relations between races. Relevant studies may be cited with respect to housing,²⁵ employment,²⁶ the armed

services²⁷ and merchant marine,²⁸ recreation agency,²⁹ and general community life.³⁰

Much depends, however, on the circumstances under which members of previously segregated groups first come in contact with others in unsegregated situations. Available evidence suggests, first, that there is less likelihood of unfriendly relations when the change is simultaneously introduced into all units of a social institution to which it is applicable—e. g., all of the schools in a school system or all of the shops in a given factory.³¹ When factories introduced Negroes in only some shops but not in others the prejudiced workers tended to classify the desegregated shops as inferior, "Negro work." Such objections were not raised when complete integration was introduced.

²¹ Conover, R. D., *Race Relations at Cordornices Village, Berkeley-Albany, California; A Report of the Attempt to Break Down the Segregated Pattern on a Directly Managed Housing Project*, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Public Housing Administration, Region I, December 1947 (mimeographed); Deutsch, M. and Collins, M. E., *Interracial Housing, A Psychological Study of A Social Experiment*, 1951; Rutledge, E., *Integration of Racial Minorities in Public Housing Project: A Guide for Local Housing Authorities on How to Do It*, Public Housing Administration, New York Field Office (mimeographed)

²² Minard, R. D., *The Pattern of Race Relationships in the Pocahontas Coal Field*, *J. Social Issues*, 1952, 8, 29-44; Southall, S. E., *Industry's Unfinished Business*, 1951; Weaver, G. L-P., *Negro Labor, A National Problem*, 1941.

²³ Southall, S. E., *Industry's Unfinished Business*, 1951; Weaver, G. L-P., *Negro Labor, A National Problem*, 1941.

²⁴ Lee, A. McClung and Humphrey, N. D., *Race Riot*, 1943; Lee, A. McClung, *Race Riots Aren't Necessary*, *Public Affairs Pamphlet*, 1945.

²⁵ Deutsch, M. and Collins, M. E., *Interracial Housing, A Psychological Study of A Social Experiment*, 1951; Merton, R. K.; West, P. S.; Jahoda, M., *Social Fictions and Social Facts: The Dynamics of Race Relations in Hilltown*, Bureau of Applied Social Research Columbia, Univ., 1949 (mimeographed); Rutledge, E., *Integration of Racial Minorities in Public Housing Projects; A Guide for Local Housing Authorities on How To Do It*, Public Housing Administration, New York Field Office (mimeographed); Wilner, D. M.; Walkley, R. P.; and Cook, S. W., *Intergroup Contact and Ethnic Attitudes in Public Housing Projects*, *J. Social Issues*, 1952, 8, 45-69.

²⁶ Harding, J., and Hogrefe, R., *Attitudes of White Department Store Employees Toward Negro Co-workers*, *J. Social Issues*, 1952, 8, 19-28; Southall, S. E., *Industry's Unfinished Business*, 1951; Weaver, G. L-P., *Negro Labor, A National Problem*, 1941.

²⁷ Kenworthy, E. W. *The Case Against Army Segregation*, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 1951, 275, 27-33; Nelson, Lt. D. D., *The Integration of the Negro in the U. S. Navy*, 1951; Stouffer, S., et al., *The American Soldier*, Vol. I Chap. 19, *A Note on Negro Troops in Combat*, 1949; Watson, G., *Action for Unity*, 1947; *Opinions About Negro Infantry Platoons in White Companies in Several Divisions*, *Information and Education Division, U. S. War Department, Report No. B-157*, 1945.

²⁸ Brophy, I. N., *The Luxury of Anti-Negro Prejudice*, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 1946, 9, 456-466 (*Integration in Merchant Marine*); Watson, G., *Action for Unity*, 1947.

²⁹ Williams, D. H., *The Effects of an Interracial Project Upon the Attitudes of Negro and White Girls Within the Young Women's Christian Association*, Unpublished M. A. thesis, Columbia University, 1934.

³⁰ Dean, J. P., *Situational Factors in Intergroup Relation: A Research Progress Report*. Paper Presented to American Sociological Society, 12/28/49 (mimeographed) of Boulder, Colorado, to the Introduction ed); Irish, D. P., *Reactions of Residents of Japanese Into the Community*, *J. Social Issues*, 1952, 8, 10-17.

³¹ Minard, R. D., *The Pattern of Race Relationships in the Pocahontas Coal Field*, *J. Social Issues*, 1952, 8, 29-44; Rutledge, E., *Integration of Racial Minorities in Public Housing Projects; A Guide for Local Housing Authorities on How to Do It*, Public Housing Administration, New York Field Office (mimeographed).

The available evidence also suggests the importance of consistent and firm enforcement of the new policy by those in authority.³² It indicates also the importance of such factors as: the absence of competition for a limited number of facilities or benefits;³³ the possibility of contacts which permit individuals to learn about one another as individuals;³⁴ and the possibility of equivalence of positions and functions among all of the participants within the unsegregated situation.³⁵ These conditions can generally be satisfied in a number of situations, as in the armed services, public housing developments, and public schools.

IV

The problem with which we have here attempted to deal is admittedly on the frontiers of scientific knowledge. Inevitably, there must be some differences of opinion among us concerning the conclusiveness of certain items of evidence, and concerning the particular choice of words and placement of emphasis in the preceding statement. We are nonetheless in agreement that this statement is substantially correct and justified by the evidence, and the differences among us, if any, are of a relatively minor order and would not materially influence the preceding conclusions.

FLOYD H. ALLPORT, Syracuse, New York
GORDON W. ALLPORT, Cambridge, Mass.
CHARLOTTE BABCOCK, M. D., Chicago, Ill.
VIOLA W. BERNARD, M. D., N. Y., N. Y.
JEROME S. BRUNER, Cambridge, Mass.
HADLEY CANTRIL, Princeton, New Jersey

³² Deutsch, M. and Collins, M. E., *Interracial Housing, A Psychological Study of A Social Experiment*, *1951, Feldman, H., The Technique of Introducing Negroes Into the Plant, *Personnel*, 1942, 19, 461-466; Rutledge, E., *Integration of Racial Minorities in Public Housing Projects; A Guide for Local Housing Authorities on How to Do It*, Public Housing Administration, New York Field Office (mimeographed); Southall, S. E., *Industry's Unfinished Business*, 1951; Watson, G., *Action for Unity*, 1947.

³³ Lee, A. McClung and Humphrey, N. D., *Race Riot*, 1943; Williams, R., Jr., *The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions*, Social Science Research Council, New York, 1947; Windner, A. E., *White Attitudes Towards Negro-White Interaction In An Area of Changing Racial Composition*. Paper Delivered at the Sixtieth Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, September 1952.

³⁴ Wilner, D. M.; Walkley, R. P.; and Cook, S. W., *Intergroup Contact and Ethnic Attitudes in Public Housing Projects*, *J. Social Issues*, 1952, 8, 45-69.

³⁵ Allport, G. W., and Kramer, B., *Some Roots of Prejudice*, *J. Psychol.*, 1946, 22, 9-39; Watson, J., *Some Social and Psychological Situations Related to Change in Attitude*, *Human Relations*, 1950, 3, 1.

ISIDOR CHEIN, New York, New York
KENNETH B. CLARK, New York, N. Y.
MAMIE P. CLARK, New York, New York
STUART W. COOK, New York, New York
BINGHAM DALE, Durham, North Carolina
ALLISON DAVIS, Chicago, Illinois
ELSE FRENKEL-BRUNSWIK, Berkeley, Calif.
NOEL P. GIST, Columbia, Missouri
CHARLES S. JOHNSON, Nashville, Tennessee
DANIEL KATZ, Ann Arbor, Michigan
OTTO KLINEBERG, New York, New York
DAVID KRECH, Berkeley, California
ALFRED MC CLUNG LEE, Brooklyn, N. Y.
R. N. MACIVER, New York, New York
PAUL F. LAZARSFELD, New York, N. Y.
ROBERT K. MERTON, New York, N. Y.
GARDNER MURPHY, Topeka, Kansas
THEODORE M. NEWCOMB, Ann Arbor Mich.
ROBERT REDFIELD, Chicago, Illinois
IRA DE A. REID, Haverford, Pennsylvania
ARNOLD M. ROSE, Minneapolis, Minn.
GERHART SAENGER, New York, New York
R. NEVITT SANFORD, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
S. STANFIELD SARGENT, New York, N. Y.
M. BREWSTER SMITH, New York, N. Y.
SAMUEL A. STOUFFER, Cambridge, Mass.
WELLMAN WARNER, New York, N. Y.
GOODWIN WATSON, New York, New York
ROBIN M. WILLIAMS, Ithaca, New York
Dated: September 22, 1952.

REFERENCES

- ADORNO, T. W.; FRENKEL-BRUNSWIK, E. LEVINSON, D. J.; SANFORD, R. N., *The Authoritarian Personality*, 1951.
ALLPORT, G. W., and KRAMER, B., *Some Roots of Prejudice*, *J. Psychol.*, 1946, 22, 9-39.
BAUER, C., *Social Questions in Housing and Community Planning*, *J. of Social Issues*, 1951, VII, 1-34.
BRAMELD, T., *Educational Costs Discrimination and National Welfare*, Ed. by MacIver, R. M., 1949.
BRENMAN, M., *The Relationship Between Minority Group Identification in A Group of Urban Middle Class Negro Girls*, *J. Soc. Psychol.*, 1940, 11, 171-197.
BRENMAN, M., *Minority Group Membership and Religious, Psychosexual and Social Patterns in A Group of Middle-Class Negro Girls*, *J. Soc. Psychol.*, 1940, 12, 179-196.
BRENMAN, M., *Urban Lower-Class Negro Girls*, *Psychiatry*, 1943, 6, 307-324.
BROOKS, J. J., *Intergroup Grouping on Trial. Continuous Learning*, *Bulletin No. 87 of the Association for Childhood Education*, 1951.
BROPHY, I. N., *The Luxury of Anti-Negro Prejudice*, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 1946, 9, 456-466 (Intergation in Merchant Marine).
CHEIN, I., *What are the Psychological Effects of Segregation Under Conditions of Equal Facilities?*, *International J. Opinion & Attitude Res.*, 1949, 2, 229-234.

- CLARK, K. B., Effect of Prejudice and Discrimination on Personality Development, *Fact Finding Report Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth*, Children's Bureau-Federal Security Agency, 1950 (mimeographed).
- CLARK, K. B. & CLARK, M. P., Emotional Factors in Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children, *J. Negro Educ.*, 1950, 19, 341-350.
- CLARK, K. B. & CLARK, M. P., Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children, *Readings in Social Psychology*, Ed. by Newcomb & Hartley, 1947.
- CONOVER, R. D., *Race Relations at Codornices Village, Berkeley-Albany, California: A Report of the Attempts to Break Down the Segregated Pattern On A Directly Managed Housing Project*, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Public Housing Administration, Region I, 1947 (mimeographed).
- DAVIS, A., The Socialization of the American Negro Child and Adolescent, *J. Negro Educ.*, 1939, 8, 264-275.
- DEAN, J. P., *Situational Factors in Intergroup Relations: A Research Progress Report*, paper presented to American Sociological Society, Dec. 28, 1949 (mimeographed).
- DELANO, W., Grade School Segregation: The Latest Attack on Racial Discrimination, *Yale Law Journal*, 1952, 61, 730-744.
- DEUTSCHER, M. and CHEIN, I., The Psychological Effects of Enforced Segregation: A Survey of Social Science Opinion, *J. Psychol.*, 1948, 26, 259-287.
- DEUTSCH, M. and COLLINS, M. E., *Interracial Housing, A Psychological Study of a Social Experiment*, 1951.
- FELDMAN, H., The Technique of Introducing Negroes Into the Plant, *Personnel*, 1942, 19, 461-466.
- FRAZIER, E., *The Negro In the United States*, 1949.
- HARDING, J., and HOGREFE, R., Attitudes of White Department Store Employees Toward Negro Co-Workers, *J. Social Issues*, 1952, 8, 19-28.
- IRISH, D. P., Reactions of Residents of Boulder, Colorado to the Introduction of Japanese Into the Community, *J. Social Issues*, 1952, 8, 10-17.
- KENWORTHY, E. W., The Case Against Army Segregation, *Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 1951, 275, 27-33.
- KLINEBERG, O., *Characteristics of American Negro*, 1945.
- KLINBERG, O., *Negro Intelligence and Selective Migration*, 1935.
- KLINEBERG, O., *Race Differences*, 1936.
- KRECH, D. & CRUTCHFIELD, R. S., *Theory and Problems of Social Psychology*, 1948.
- LANE, R. H., *Teacher in Modern Elementary School*, 1941.
- LEE, A. MCCLUNG and HUMPHREY, N. D., *Race Riot*, 1943.
- LEE, A. MCCLUNG, *Race Riot Aren't Necessary*, *Public Affairs Pamphlet*, 1945.
- MERTON, R. K.; WEST, P. S.; JAHODA, M., *Social Fictions and Social Facts: The Dynamics of Race Relations in Hilltown*; Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1949 (mimeographed).
- MINARD, R. D., The Pattern of Race Relationships in the Pocahontas Coal Field, *J. Social Issues*, 1952, 8, 29-44.
- MYRDAL, G., *An American Dilemma*, 1944.
- NEWCOMB, T., *Social Psychology*, 1950.
- NELSON, Lt. D. D., *The Integration of the Negro in the U. S. Navy*, 1951.
- RACKOW, F., Combatting Discrimination in Employment, *Bulletin No. 5*, N. Y. State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell Univ., 1951.
- RADKE, M., TRAGER, H., DAVIS, H., Social Preceptions and Attitudes of Children, *Genetic Psychol. Monog.*, 1949, 40, 327-447.
- RADKE, M., TRAGER, H., Children's Perceptions of the Social Role of Negroes and Whites, *J. Psychol.*, 1950, 29, 3-33.
- REID, Ira., *What Segregated Areas Mean, Discrimination and National Welfare*, Ed. by MacIver, R. M., 1949.
- ROSE, A., The Influence of Legislation on Prejudice, Chapter 53 in *Race Prejudice and Discrimination*, Ed. by Rose, A., 1951.
- ROSE, A., *Studies in Reduction of Prejudice*, Amer. Council on Race Relations, 1948.
- RUTLEDGE, E., *Integration of Racial Minorities in Public Housing Projects; A guide for Local Housing Authorities on How to Do It*. Public Housing Administration, New York Field Office (mimeographed).
- SAENGER, G. and GILBERT, E., Customer Reactions to the Intergration of Negro Sales Personnel, *International Journal of Attitude and Opinion Research*, 1950, 4, 1, 57-76.
- SAENGER, G. & GORDON, N. S., The Influence of Discrimination on Minority Group Members in its Relation to Attempts to Combat Discrimination, *J. Soc. Psychol.*, 1950, 31.
- SOUTHALL, S. E., *Industry's Unfinished Business*, 1951.
- STOUFFER, S. et al., *The American Soldier*, Vol. I, Chap. 19, A Note on Negro Troops in Combat, 1949.
- WATSON, G., *Action for Unity*, 1947.
- WATSON, J., Some Social and Psychological Situations Related to Change in Attitude, *Human Relations*, 1950, 3, 1.
- WEAVER, G. L-P., *Negro Labor, A National Problem*, 1941.
- WILLIAMS, D. H., *The Effects of an Interracial Project Upon the Attitudes of Negro and White Girls Within the Young Women's Christian Association*, Unpublished M. A. thesis, Columbia University, 1934.

WILLIAMS, R., Jr., *The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions*, Social Science Research Council, 1947.

WILNER, D. M., WALKLEY, R. P.; and COOK, S. W., *Intergroup Contact and Ethnic Attitudes in Public Housing Projects*, *J. Social Issues*, 1952, 8, 45-69.

WINDNER, A. E., *White Attitudes Towards Negro-White Interaction in an Area of Changing Racial Composition*, Paper delivered at the Sixtieth Annual Meeting

of The American Psychological Association, Washington, September 1952.

Opinions about Negro Infantry Platoons in White Companies in Several Divisions, *Information and Education Division, U. S. War Department, Report No. B-157*, 1945.

Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administration Report in, *Education For All Americans* published by the N.E.A. 1948.

THE SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS

(An Affiliate of the American Sociological Society)

announces

THE FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING

August 30 — September 2, 1955,

The Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C.

AUGUST 30th SESSIONS:

New Slants on Juvenile Delinquency, H. Ashley Weeks, Ohio State University, *Chairman Psychotherapy and Social Science, Chairman to be announced.* Family Factors and Health, Reuben Hill, University of North Carolina, *Chairman.*

Desegregation and the Schools, *Chairman to be announced.* Graduate Student Views of the Training of Sociologists, Jerome H. Skolnick, Yale University, and Denez Guyeas, Kent State University, *Chairmen.*

JOINT SESSIONS WITH THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY, AUGUST 31 — SEPTEMBER 2:

PROBLEMS OF AGING
POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY

SOCIOLOGY AND HEALTH
SOCIOLOGY AND MENTAL HEALTH

Papers and suggestions for additional sessions should be sent before May 15, 1955 to A. R. Mangus, Ohio State University, Columbus 10, Ohio.

PROGRAM COMMITTEE:

GUY B. JOHNSON, *University of North Carolina*

ROSE HUM LEE, *Roosevelt University*

CHARLES P. LOOMIS, *Michigan State College*

PAUL OREN, *Kent State University*

H. ASHLEY WEEKS, *Ohio State University*

A. RAYMOND MANGUS, *Ohio State University, Chairman*

BOOK REVIEWS

Prosperity and Parenthood. By J. A. Banks. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul (distributed by Grove Press, New York), 1954, 240. pp. \$4.50.

This little book is part of the "International Library of Sociology and Social Reconstruction" series, founded by Karl Mannheim. The author is a former student of Professor D. V. Glass of the London School of Economics, and is at present lecturing in Sociology at University College, Leicester, England. He writes lucidly and systematically, in the English tradition.

The central theme is revealed in the book's subtitle, "a Study of Family Planning Among the Victorian Middle Classes." Banks looks to the rising living standard as the chief factor explaining England's fertility drop during the last few decades of the Nineteenth Century. He develops this thesis both empirically and logically, drawing upon the literary documents (essays, pamphlets, novels, magazines, letters) of the periods studied, and examining all relevant factors in the light of evidence presented. This leads to considerations of such phenomena as the population controversy, age at marriage, family incomes and expenditures, and the birth control movement. But the evidence isn't always conclusive and the author is modest in his claims. He is especially clear in acknowledging the fact that the standard of living is only one of several possible factors explaining the retreat from parenthood (though he believes it the most important one), and in calling for more research.

"Standard of living" is viewed as incorporating two logically distinct ideas: (1) the actual material well-being of people; and (2) the attitudes and values surrounding material wealth — the normative aspect. This is the separation in meaning that American sociologists frequently make between "level" and "standard" of living, and it is a valuable distinction. Banks finds both level and standard to have increased rapidly prior to the 1870's in middle-class England. The "Great Depression" of that period was found not to have actually reduced income but to have undermined one's sense of security and expansion acquired during the more prosperous years — and this had essentially the same effect. Uncertainty

concerning the future, coupled with an expanding need for education, etc., led to an acceptance of contraception as a means for avoiding any reduction in the material comforts. Thus, this study correctly considers value norms as being more significant in motivating fertility reduction than the actual levels at which people live.

Though this is a population analysis, essentially, there is much in it that will also be of interest to the family sociologist, the historian, and the social scientist generally. It reports fresh materials about middle-class Victorian England in an analytical fashion.

HAROLD T. CHRISTENSEN

Purdue University

The Mental Hospital: A Study of Institutional Participation in Psychiatric Illness and Treatment. By Alfred H. Stanton and Morris S. Schwartz. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1954. xx, 492 pp. \$7.50.

A psychiatrist and a sociologist here report the results of three years of collaborative research focused on one ward of a mental hospital. The hospital was one with which the psychiatrist had been associated for some time — a private institution in which nearly all patients received psychotherapy. It was thus exceedingly atypical of mental hospitals in general. Yet the rich descriptive report of interaction among patients and staff undoubtedly carries valid insights into processes which occur in any setting where therapists are working with mental patients.

Whether they are discussing the formal organization of the hospital, the process of communication, or the circumstances under which pathological excitements and incontinence occur among patients, the focus of attention for Stanton and Schwartz is upon the implications for the patient's illness and improvement. The formal structure is by no means ignored but is considered with much more attention to the feelings that go with particular roles or positions within communication networks and power structure than one ordinarily finds in a piece of sociological research. The patient never becomes an incomprehensible de-personalized psychotic, partly because the authors share a psychiatric sub-culture which maintains that if one but has

sufficient insight, the most psychotic behavior will be comprehensible.

In the culture of the hospital studied, the practice of intensive psychotherapy is the highest value. In documenting how assumptions relating to the value system of this culture are interwoven with various institutional practices, formal and informal, Stanton and Schwartz combine the clinical and ethnological approach. They do not, however, use a systematic set of concepts or categories such as an ethnologist would use. As a source of insights into interpersonal processes in an institutional setting, the work is unparalleled in the field of hospital studies. Just as any good study of another culture can illuminate the ways in which behavior is patterned in one's own culture, this study can illuminate behavior in other settings; but just as one must hesitate to generalize from the content of one culture to that of another, the reader must be wary of overgeneralizing in the present instance.

This book is a "must" for research workers and teachers in the mental health field and for those concerned with the functioning of institutions.

J. A. CLAUSEN

Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Institute of Health, Bethesda.

Psychotherapy and Personality Change.

Edited by Carl R. Rogers and Rosalind F. Dymond. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954, 464 pp. \$6.00

The client-centered school of psychotherapy is among the most research-oriented of contemporary schools of psychotherapy. Consistent with this empirical emphasis, this volume comprises a series of reports of an on-going research project which is designed to test the effectiveness of this therapeutic method. In setting out to devise scientific standards for measuring psychotherapeutic success, it goes far beyond the intuitive judgments of many therapeutic studies because it relies upon pertinent statistical techniques, such as the Q-sorts, and avails itself of projective tests and personality tests and case studies for ascertaining personality changes. By using concepts such as "the self", "perception", "attitudes towards others", "maturity", it focuses attention primarily upon the changes in personality structure.

The reported findings in the discrete studies are that persons treated by this method usually experience moderate improvement (in contrast to a non-treated

control group who showed no personality change.) These treated subjects manifest their improvement by acquiring a more realistic conception of themselves and of their goals. They begin to regard other persons from a different perspective, namely, as being more like themselves, and as a result can relate to them with greater comfort. These subjects become more realistic because their conceptions of themselves become more congruent with their ideal conceptions of themselves. Thus change in self-perception is a crucial aspect of personality growth. To isolate these effects as dependent variables, not only were non-treated subjects used as controls, but some subjects were tested after a wait of 60 days, without being treated as a control period, and then went into therapy. Positive personality changes were noted only for the treated subjects after the treatment began.

The extent of the improvement of the 25 treated subjects was limited because over one-half of these subjects were neither problem-free nor completely integrated when the therapy was completed. This research candor concerning the merits and limitations of client-centered counseling is especially welcome because most schools of therapy are dedicated to complete self-praise.

But the weaknesses of this treatment method inhere in its assumptions as well as in its procedures. First, since their theory of personality growth seems to have been explicitly formulated from the treatment technique, this technique has not been demonstrated to be always or necessarily the most effective instrument for achieving personality growth. In some instances, the therapist has to provide guided intervention to facilitate the patients' insights into his conflicts and thereby to achieve personality change. Second, superficial personality changes which result in the early stages of therapy are easy to achieve because they are within the reach of consciousness. But the deeper conflicts which are not accessible to conscious manipulation are more difficult to resolve, and many times cannot be resolved without some guided interpretation because the patient will not face these conflicts. Third, the client-centered therapist has no provision for dealing with patients who undergo overwhelming anxiety. The implication is that the patient must solve these matters himself. But some patients will tend to demand emotional support from the therapist, who, by refusing to assume this

role, will tend to impress them as remaining indifferent to their problems or as rejecting them. For this reason, this mode of therapy is best suited to those persons who can tolerate intense anxiety or who have mild disturbances. Fourth, despite the non-directive modes of verbal interaction, it becomes increasingly necessary to investigate the sub-verbal modes of interaction, which may reveal subtle modes of approval or disapproval. Fifth, the attempt to concentrate primarily upon inner conflict-solving as the means to personality growth tends to overlook the force of a substantive value-system upon personal stability. These qualifications notwithstanding, this volume is a definite contribution to a sound research analysis of one mode of therapy and a convincing presentation of its accrued benefits for articulate, mildly disturbed, educated persons.

S. KIRSON WEINBERG

Roosevelt University

The Rural-Urban Fringe: A Study of Adjustment to Residence Location. By Walter T. Martin. Eugene: The University of Oregon Press, 1953. v, 109 pp. \$1.25.

This study deals with the fringe areas surrounding the two small cities of Eugene and Springfield in the state of Oregon. It is a statistical study based on a house-to-house survey by student interviewers of families from sample areas adjoining the two cities. At the outset, the author makes a critical review of previous fringe studies and concludes that they contain five persistent shortcomings as follows: (1) inadequate theoretical foundation, (2) absence of comparable study areas, (3) inadequate statement and treatment of hypotheses, (4) inadequate sampling procedure, and (5) the resulting inadequate basis for making generalizations about the universe of study. The author then sets out to avoid these inadequacies.

A schedule was devised containing some 80 questions, most of them consisting of the census type, and some of these broken down into sub-units. Use was made of Chapin's social status scale and social participation scale. Also a new scale was constructed by the author for use in this project called the Rural-Urban Residential Preference Scale (RURP) along the lines of the Guttman technique.

The sampling consisted in dividing the total study area into "six major subdivisions designated as census districts and

composed of quarter sections, the adopted primary sampling units. A sample of the fringe population was obtained by first selecting a random sample of quarter sections from each of the census districts and then a subsample of dwelling units from each of the selected quarter sections. Interviewers were permitted no choice of dwelling units; contacts were made only at designated dwelling units. No substitutions were made where residents could not be contacted or where they refused to give the desired information (pp. 32-33). The field work was done in 1949. A total of 960 interviews were attempted and 832 completed.

Two general hypotheses were tested in the study. One is referred to as the hypothesis of accessibility. The second is labelled the hypothesis of sociocultural influences. In each case a series of corollary propositions was formulated as null hypotheses as a basis for accepting or rejecting the general hypotheses. Chi square at the 5 per cent level or beyond was used as the test of significance.

The hypothesis of accessibility holds that satisfaction with residence location is directly related to the accessibility of the location to the focal point of interaction, the city center. The results with reference to this proposition were not consistent and the author concludes that only further research can decide the validity. He expresses the opinion, however, "that distance *per se* . . . is not the major factor in determining the fringe resident's attitude toward living in the area" (p. 48).

On the other hand, the data seem to show that sociocultural influences, involving roles, statuses etc., are related to adjustment in the fringe. The well adjusted male, for example, is likely to be middle-aged, to have spent his childhood mainly in rural areas, is in the upper one-third of the fringe income bracket, belongs to one or more organizations in the fringe area, owns at least a half acre of land, and enjoys working in the garden.

The study is important more for its methodological approach than for its contribution toward understanding suburban life. Many of the conclusions have been observed in previous studies; but this attempt to organize the study in such a manner as to use sound sampling procedures and to test definitely formulated hypotheses make it an important contribution to research in suburbanization.

N. L. WHETTEN

The University of Connecticut

Publications Received

Listing of a publication below does not preclude its being reviewed in a subsequent issue of *Social Problems*.

- Berdyaev, Nicolas. *Christianity and Anti-Semitism*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1954. 58 pp. \$2.75.
- Bersh, Mildred. *Steward Training in C.I.O. Unions*. New York: Student League for Industrial Democracy, 1954. 39 pp. No price indicated.
- Bram, Joseph. *Language and Society*. Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1955. VIII, 66 pp. \$0.95.
- Crosser, Paul K. *The Nihilism of John Dewey*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955. XI, 238 pp. \$3.75.
- Davis, Robert E. *American Negro's Dilemma*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1954. XII, 147 pp. \$3.00.
- Dunner, Joseph. *Baruch Spinoza and Western Democracy*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955. XIII, 142 pp. \$3.00.
- Ferm, Vergilius (Editor). *A Dictionary of Pastoral Psychology*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955. \$6.00.
- Fisher, Robert Moore (Editor). *The Metropolis in Modern Life*. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1955. XIII, 401 pp. \$6.00.
- Giles, H. Harry. *Human Dynamics and Human Relations Education*. New York: New York University Press, 1954. VII, 108 pp. No price indicated.
- Greer, Scott A. *Social Organization*. Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1955. VII, 68 pp. \$0.95.
- Himes, Joseph S. *Social Planning in America*. New York: Doubleday & Co., 1954, XI, 59 pp. \$0.95.
- Hoebel, E. Adamson. *The Law of Primitive Man*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954. VIII, 357 pp. \$5.50.
- Hoebel, E. Adamson, Jesse D. Jennings, and Elmer R. Smith (Editors). *Readings in Anthropology*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1955. XIV, 417 pp. \$6.00.
- The Institute for Urban Studies. *Accelerated Urban Growth in a Metropolitan Fringe Area*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1954. Volume I, XV, 63 pp. \$2.00. Volume II, XXV. 262 pp., 98 Tables. \$4.00. Volumes I and II. \$5.00.
- Jaffee, A. J. and R. O. Carlton. *Occupational Mobility in the United States 1930-1960*. New York: King's Crown Press, 1954. XIV, 105 pp. \$2.75.
- Knodel, Jay C. *An Intellectual Primer*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955. 88 pp. \$2.50.
- Lauterbach, Albert. *Man, Motives, and Money*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press 1954. XIV, 366 pp. \$5.00.
- Lay, Tracy H. *Beyond Our Limitations*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955. XII, 114 pp. \$3.00.
- Lee, Raymond L., James A. Burkhard, and Van B. Shaw. *Contemporary Social Issues*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1955. 864 pp. \$3.95.
- Lee, Rose Hum. *The City, Urbanism and Urbanization in Major World Regions*. Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1955. VIII, 568 pp. \$5.50.
- Lemert, Edwin M. *Alcohol and the Northwest Coast Indians*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1954. Volume II, No. 6 pp. 303-406. No price indicated.
- Lorimer, Frank, et al. *Culture and Human Fertility*. Zurich: Unesco, 1954. (Distributed by Columbia University Press). 514 pp. \$4.50.
- Mason, Philip. *An Essay on Racial Tension*. London & New York: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1954. IX, 149 pp. \$1.50.
- Moore, Wilbert E. *Economy and Society*. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1955. IX, 48 pp. \$0.95.
- Ogburn, W. F. and M. F. Nimkoff. *Technology and the Changing Family*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1955. IV, 329 pp. \$3.75.
- Runes, Dagobert (Editor). *Treasury of Philosophy*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955. XXIV, 1280 pp. \$15.00.
- Sutherland, Edwin H. and Donald R. Cressey. *Principles of Criminology* (Fifth Edition). Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1955. VIII, 646 pp. \$6.00.

- Taft, Donald R. and Richard Robbins. *International Migrations; The Immigrant in the Modern World*. New York: The Ronald Press, 1955. VIII, 670 pp. \$7.00.
- Timasheff, Nicholas S. *Sociological Theory; Its Nature and Growth*. Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1955. XV, 328 pp. \$4.50.
- United Nations. *Elements of Immigration Policy*. New York: United Nations, Department of Social Affairs, Population Division, 1954. V, 21 pp. \$0.25. (Distributed by Columbia University Press.)
- United Nations. *Future Population Estimates by Sex and Age; Report I, The Population of Central America (including Mexico)*, 1950-1980. New York: United Nations, 1954. 84 pp. \$0.70. (Distributed by Columbia University Press.)
- United Nations. *Handbook of Population Census Methods*. New York: United Nations, 1954. VII, 143 pp. \$1.50. (Distributed by Columbia University Press.)
- United Nations. *Population and Vital Statistics*. New York: United Nations, 1954. 31 pp. \$0.30. (Distributed by Columbia University Press.)
- United Nations. *Sex and Age of International Migrants: Statistics for 1918-1947*. New York: United Nations, 1953. VII, 281 pp. \$3.00. (Distributed by Columbia University Press.)
- Vance, Rupert B. and Nicholas J. Demerath. *The Urban South*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1954. XII, 307 pp. \$5.00.
- Wayper, C. L. *Political Thought*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1954. XII, 260 pp. \$3.75.
- White, J. E. Manchip. *Anthropology*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1954. VIII, 191 pp. \$2.75.
- Wolins, Martin. *Welfare Problems and Services in Berkeley, California*. Berkeley: Council of Social Welfare and School of Social Welfare, University of California, 1954. XXII, 117 pp. \$1.50.
- Woodcock, P. G. *Concise Dictionary of Ancient History*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955. 465 pp. \$6.00.

OFFICIAL REPORTS

REPORT OF THE PROGRAM COMMITTEE

NOTICE OF THE 1955 ANNUAL MEETING

The annual meeting will be held in Washington, D. C., at the Shoreham Hotel August 30th through September 2nd. There will be one day of independent sessions on August 30th and joint sessions with the American Sociological Society beginning August 31st.

The following are the August 30th sessions and session chairmen:

- (1) *New Slants on Juvenile Delinquency*, H. Ashley Weeks, Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University, Columbus 10, O.
- (2) *Psychotherapy and Social Science*, chairman to be announced.
- (3) *Family Factors and Health*, Reuben Hill, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
- (4) *Desegregation and the Schools*, chairman to be announced.
- (5) *Graduate Student Views of the Training of Sociologists*, Jerome H. Skolnick, Yale University,

New Haven, Conn., and Denez Guyeas, Kent State University, Kent, O. For transmittal to appropriate session chairmen, papers and suggestions for additional sessions should be sent before May 15, 1955 to A. R. Mangus, Program Committee Chairman, Ohio State University, Columbus 10, O.

The annual dinner of the Society, scheduled for 6:30 P. M. August 30th, will be followed by the annual business meeting. The joint sessions with the American Sociological Society, each being developed by joint chairmen, will be devoted to the following topics:

- (1) *Problems of Aging*;
- (2) *Political Sociology*;
- (3) *Sociology and Health*, and
- (4) *Sociology and Mental Health*. Dr. Dorothy K. Newman, 3508 Woodbine Ave., Chevy Chase, Md., is chairman of the Local Arrangements Committee.

Signed:

Guy B. Johnson, Rose Hum Lee, Charles P. Loomis, H. Ashley Weeks, Paul Oren, A. R. Mangus, Chairman

REPORT OF THE EDITORIAL AND PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE

W. W. Norton Company has published the Society's first book of readings, *Mental Health and Mental Disorder: A Sociological Approach*, edited by Arnold M. Rose. In recognition of the high quality and wide appeal of this volume, the Basic Book Service has chosen it as its selection for the month of March. During the next few months W. W. Norton Company will publish the Society's second book of readings, *Sexual Behavior in American Society: An Appraisal of the First Two Kinsey Reports*, edited by Jerome Himmelhoch and Sylvia Fleis Fava. The committee suggests that SSSP members examine these volumes for possible classroom use in relevant courses and also that they order copies for their libraries.

THE HELEN L. DERROY AWARD

The Society will present at its fifth annual meeting the Helen L. DeRoy Award of five hundred dollars to the author or co-authors of the best article reporting on research in the field of Social Problems. The members of the Committee on the Helen L. DeRoy Award are Howard Becker, *Chairman*; Sylvia Fleis Fava, *Secretary*; William L. Kolb; Manfred Kuhn; S. M. Lipset; Paul Meadows; and Alfred P. Parsell, *in charge of publicity*. Further details concerning the Award are presented in the advertisement on the outside back cover of this issue of SOCIAL PROBLEMS.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS 1945-1955

Committee on Budget, Auditing and Finance: Henry Meyer, *Chairman*; Donald J. Hager; Odin Anderson.

New Projects Committee: Alfred M. Lee, *Chairman*; Joseph W. Eaton; Paul Meadows; Frederick Terrien; Joseph Gittler; Milton M. Gordon; Preston Valien; Tom Eliot; James W. Carper; Samuel H. Flowerman.

Committee on Local Arrangements for the Washington Meeting: Dorothy Newman, *Chairman*; Paul H. Furley; Jacob G. Franz; Harold Mendelsohn; Harry Walker.

Elections Committee: Harry Roberts, *Chairman*; Frank F. Lee; Carroll D. Clark; Max Burchard; Joseph S. Himes.

Program Committee: A. Raymond Mangus, *Chairman*; Rose Hum Lee; Guy B. Johnson; Paul Oren; Charles P. Loomis; Ashley Weeks.

Committee on Liaison with Other Organizations: Arnold Rose, *Chairman*; Dorothy K. Newman; S. S. Sargent; Donald J. Hager; Paul H. Furley; Shirley H. Star; Lloyd Allen Cook; Robert C. Jones; Edgar H. Schuler; Max Wolfe Henry Meyer; Whitney Young; Ralph Turner; Harvey Locke.

NEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Bulletin of the Research Exchange on the Prevention of War will appear in printed form beginning with the January, 1955 issue. The *Bulletin* is intended to stimulate and facilitate social science research on the problem of war. Sample copies and subscriptions for the current year may be obtained by writing to Dr. James Russell, Centenary Junior College, Hackettstown, New Jersey. The minimum subscription is one dollar and those who can afford it are asked to pay more. Material for publication in the *Bulletin* should be submitted to the editor, Dr. Arthur Gladstone, Psychology Department Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania.

NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund to ease the change from segregated to non-segregated public schools in compliance with the May 17th decision of the United States Supreme Court, the N.A.A.C.P. Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. has established a Social Science

Department under the direction of a Committee of Consultants including forty-three social scientists, with Alfred M. Lee as Chairman. This department will make social science findings and materials available to educators, school officials and civic organizations and its members will continue to serve as expert witnesses in civil rights litigation.

The Rural Sociological Society will hold its Annual Meeting on the campus of the University of Maryland at College Park, Maryland on August 29 and 30, 1955 with joint sessions at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington, D. C. with the American Sociological Society on August 31, 1955. The theme of the annual meeting will be *Research in Rural Sociology*. The program is organized around several important research areas: Social Institutions; Community and Neighborhood; Peasant Societies; Technological Change; Social Psychology; Research Methods; Application of Research Findings to Action Programs; the Subur-

ban Community; Social Stratification; and Population. The latter three sessions are joint with the American Sociological Society. In addition, there will be two general sessions, a barbecue and a tour of U. S. D.A.'s Agricultural Research Center at Beltsville, Maryland. Further information about the program is available from William H. Sewell, President, The Rural Sociological Society, 314 Agricultural Hall, University of Wisconsin, Madison 6, Wisconsin. Information about lodging is available from Wayne Rohrer, Department of Sociology, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.

The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues announces a program of grants-in-aid for research on desegregation. A total of \$1000.00 has been made available for such awards, but no single grant will be made in excess of \$500.00. Applications specifying budgetary needs and giving sufficient detail to make possible an evaluation of the proposed project must be submitted to Isidor Chein, Committee Chairman, (Research Center for Human Relations, New York University, 104 East Ninth Street, New York 3, N. Y.) before June 1, 1955. It will be helpful if applications are made out in quadruplicate.

The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues statement on the Relation of Investigating Committees to Academic and Scientific Freedom, adopted last spring by the members of the Society, is appearing in the January issue of the *American Psychologist*. The text of the statement follows:

SPSSI encourages scientists in their adherence to the principle of freedom and independence of thought, speech and scientific investigation. SPSSI will support any of its members whose adherence to this principle brings them under attack.

SPSSI respects the rights of individuals who refuse to divulge their political and religious beliefs and lawful associations. The wisdom of recourse to the Fifth Amendment may be questioned, and one may perhaps even question the legality of appealing to this Amendment as a means of maintaining the privacy of one's beliefs or associations. Nevertheless, SPSSI does not regard such recourse as in itself sufficient to deprive a member of the Society's support. Such support will be given provided that SPSSI has no reason to question his professional integrity.

Recognizing that an individual in taking such action may expose himself to severe consequences as to professional employment, SPSSI obligates itself to help a SPSSI member retain or regain professional employment last as a result of such a stand.

University of California at Berkeley: the graduate students in the Department of Sociology and Social Institutions have established a new journal, "Berkeley Publications in Society and Institutions", devoted to articles of general sociological interest written by graduate students in sociology. Plans are to issue this publication initially twice a year in multigraphed form. Articles and other communications should be sent, to The Editor, "Berkeley Publications in Society and Institutions," 206 South Hall, University of California, Berkeley 4, California.

University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida: the Department of Human Relations is sponsoring a six weeks Workshop on Theory and Practice in Human Relations, June 14 to July 23, 1955. The Workshop will carry six semester credits on both the undergraduate and graduate levels. A limited number of scholarships will be available. For further information, write directly to Dr. Dean George Epley, Chairman of the Department of Human Relations and Director of the Workshop. The first part of the Workshop will be concerned with the theoretical foundations of human relations; and the second part, with practical applications in public and private agencies, business and industry, education, international relations, the home, and in interracial and interfaith areas of tension.

The Yiddish Scientific Institute—Yivo—announces the seventh annual Yivo essay contest for the scholarly papers, of about 5,000 words on subjects related to Jewish life in the United States and Canada. Three awards of \$300, \$200 and \$100 are offered. The contest is open to college seniors and graduate students. The closing date is October 15, 1955. All manuscripts and other communications should be addressed to the Commission on Research, Yivo, 535 West 123rd Street, New York 27, New York.

Howard University announces a number of undergraduate and graduate scholarships and graduate fellowships available to qualified students who desire to acquire as a part of their general education an objective view of the present position of Africa in the modern world and an understanding of its economic, social and political problems; and for graduate students desiring to take the master's degree in the field of African studies who plan to work in the African field where a basic knowledge and understanding of the economic, social, and political problems of Africa is required. For further information write to: E. Franklin Frazier, Department of Sociology, Howard University, Washington 1, D. C.

Auster
Baltze
L
Bowm
Burge
Cohen
Frenk
Furfey
Goul
Hager
Honig
Kolb,
Lantz,
Lee,
S
Neim
Osgo
7
Rosen
a
Senio
U
Stagn
o

Allen
Gist
Lawr
S
Lee,
A
Marc
Ross,
a

Whit
Appe
Carte
A
Clark
Clark
Lee,
Long
S
Plaut
S
Reid,
Tex
Wilks

SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Published Quarterly by the Society for the Study of Social Problems

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 2, NOS. 1 - 4

ARTICLES

Auster, Donald. <i>A content Analysis of "Little Orphan Annie"</i>	26
Baltzell, E. Digby. <i>Urbanization and Governmental Administration in Lower Bucks County</i>	38
Bowman, Claude C. <i>Social Change as Reflected in the Kinsey Studies</i>	1
Burgess, Ernest W. <i>Values and Sociological Research</i>	16
Cohen, Oscar. <i>The Application of Social Research to Intergroup Relations</i>	20
Frenkel-Brunswick, Else. <i>Social Tensions and the Inhibition of Thought</i>	75
Furfey, Paul H. <i>The Social Philosophy of Social Pathologists</i>	71
Gouldner, Alvin W. <i>The Problem of Loyalty in Groups under Tension</i>	82
Hager, Don J. <i>Trailer Towns and Community Conflict in Lower Bucks County</i>	33
Honigsmann, John J. <i>An Anthropological Approach to Sex</i>	7
Kolb, William L. <i>The Impingement of Moral Values on Sociology</i>	66
Lantz, Herman R. <i>Occupational Differences in Mental Disorders</i>	100
Lee, Alfred M. <i>Sociologists in an Integrating Society: Significance and Satisfaction in Sociological Work</i>	57
Neiman, Lionel J. <i>The Influence of Peer Groups Upon Attitudes toward the Feminine Role</i>	104
Osgood, Robert E. <i>Observations on the Clinical Approach to International Tensions</i>	176
Rosenberg, Bernard. <i>Thorstein Veblen: Portrait of the Intellectual as a Marginal Man</i>	181
Senior, Clarence. <i>Patterns of Puerto Rican Dispersion in the Continental United States</i>	93
Stagner, Ross. <i>Needed Research in Social Psychology on Problems of War and Peace</i>	88

SPECIAL FEATURES

A Symposium on Segregation and Integration in College Fraternities

Allen, Dean A. <i>History of the Undergraduate Social Clubs at Princeton</i>	160
Gist Noel P. <i>Fraternal Membership Policies and Minority Groups: The Case of Missouri University</i>	165
Lawrence, Charles R. <i>Movements for the Abolition of Fraternity Segregation at Thirty-three Colleges</i>	140
Lee, Alfred M. <i>The Program of the National Committee on Fraternities in Education</i>	172
Marcson Simon, <i>Introduction to the Symposium</i>	129
Ross, Ian C. <i>Group Standards Concerning the Admission of Jews to Fraternities at the University of Michigan</i>	133
Whitney, Vincent H. <i>Fraternities at Brown University</i>	153

A Symposium on Desegregation in the Public Schools

Appendix to Appellants' Briefs: <i>Statement by Social Scientists</i>	227
Carter, Robert L. <i>Legal Background and Significance of the May 17th Decision</i>	215
Clark, Kenneth B. <i>Conclusions</i>	219
Clark, Kenneth B. <i>Introduction</i>	197
Lee, J. Oscar. <i>Protestant Churches and Public School Desegregation</i>	212
Long, Herman H. <i>The Challenge of Desegregation to Southern Social Scientists and Educators</i>	204
Plaut, Richard L. <i>Variables Affecting the Scholastic Achievement of Negro Children in Desegregated Schools</i>	207
Reid, Ira De A. <i>Desegregation and Social Change at the Community Level</i>	198
Text of the Supreme Court Opinions	221
Wilkins, Roy. <i>The Role of the NAACP in the Desegregation Process</i>	201

BOOK REVIEWS

ALLPORT, GORDON W. <i>The Nature of Prejudice</i> . Sidney H. Aronson	114
BANKS, J. A. <i>Prosperity and Parenthood</i> . Harold T. Christensen	236
BRAY, DOUGLAS W. <i>Issues in the Study of Talent</i> . Israel Gerver	48
CHAMBLISS, ROLLIN. <i>Social Thought from Hammurabi to Comte</i> . Read Bain	112
CHINOY, ELY. <i>Sociological Perspective; Basic Concepts and Their Application</i> . Philip J. Allen	116
GILLIN, JOHN, editor. <i>For a Science of Social Man: Convergences in Anthropology, Psychology, and Sociology</i> . Adolph S. Tomars	116
HASSLER, ALFRED. <i>Diary of a Self-made Convict</i> . W. C. Waterman	49
HERTZLER, JOYCE D. <i>Society in Action, A Study of Basic Social Prejudices</i> . Franz Adler	188
HODGSON, KENNETH W. <i>The Deaf and their Problems</i> . Harry Best	191
KATZ, DANIEL; CORTWRIGHT, DORWIN; ELDERSVELD, SAMUEL AND LEE, ALFRED McCLUNG (Editors). <i>Public Opinions and Propaganda: A Book of Readings</i> . James B. McKee	46
LINDBERG, JOHN. <i>Foundations of Social Survival</i> . David Bidney	190
MARTIN, WALTER T. <i>The Rural-Urban Fringe: A Study of Adjustment to Residence Location</i> . N. L. Whetten	238
MOLONEY, JAMES C. <i>Understanding the Japanese Mind</i> . Hugh H. Smythe	47
OPPENHEIMER, J. ROBERT. <i>Science and the Common Understanding</i> . Arthur S. Barron	114
PODOLSKY, EDWARD. <i>The Jealous Child</i> . Evelyn M. Duvall	116
ROGERS, CARL R., and DYMOND, ROSALIND F. <i>Psychotherapy and Personality Change</i> . S. Kirson Weinberg	237
ROSE, ARNOLD M. <i>Theory and Method in the Social Science</i> . Rex D. Hopper	190
ROSTOW, W. W. <i>The Dynamics of Soviet Society</i> . Robert A. Feldmesser	46
SCHANCK, ROBERT L. <i>The Permanent Revolution in Science</i> . B. A. Richards	114
SIMPSON, GEORGE. <i>Man in Society</i> . John Madge	48
SIMPSON, GEORGE. <i>Science as Morality</i> . John Madge	48
STANTON, ALFRED H. and SCHWARTZ, MORRIS S. <i>The Mental Hospital: A Study of Institutional Participation In Psychiatric Illness and Treatment</i> . J. A. Clausen	236
THELEN, HERBERT A. <i>Dynamics of Groups at Work</i> . Lloyd A. Cook	112
YOUNG, LEONTINE. <i>Out of Wedlock</i> . Evelyn M. Duvall	116

MISCELLANEOUS

Communications and Opinions

Miller, S. M. <i>Threats to Progress: Anti-Intellectual Trends in Contemporary U. S. A.</i>	123
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

News and Announcements

News and Announcements	54, 121, 241
------------------------------	--------------

Official Reports

Affiliation of SSSP with the American Sociological Society	121
Committee Appointments, 1954-1955	120, 240
The Helen L. DeRoy Award	241
Notice of 1955 Annual Meeting	120
Notice of Joint Meeting of SSSP and SPSSI	121
Preliminary Program, SSSP Fourth Annual Meeting	51
Report of Committee on Liaison with Other Organizations	194
Report of Committee on Student Participation	192
Report of the Editor	53, 118
Report of Editorial and Publications Committee	53, 120, 241
Report of Elections Committee	52, 192
Report of Membership Committee	194
Report of New Projects Committee	192
Report of Program Committee	240
Report of the Secretary	192
Report of Special Committee on Publisher-Author Relations	194

... 114
... 236
... 48
... 112

... 116

... 116
... 49

... 188
... 191

... 46
... 190

... 238
... 47

... 114
... 116

... 237
... 190
... 46
... 114
... 48
... 48

... 236
... 112
... 116

... 123

... 21, 241

... 121
... 20, 240
... 241
... 120
... 121
... 51
... 194
... 192
... 53, 118
... 20, 241
... 52, 192
... 194
... 192
... 240
... 192
... 194